

work himself, provided he does not try to prevent anyone else from working or in no other way attempts to interfere. Otherwise there would be no sense in section 3.

Another thing: Senators talk about interfering with the shipyards of this country. If this dealt solely with shipyards, or if it dealt solely with munition plants, then there might be some argument for striking out section 3; but it deals with practically every occupation in the United States. Every man who is running a little manufacturing establishment in the United States is included under the provision regarding "material." The product of nearly every mine is included under the head of material. Tell me this: How long would the employer be anxious for mediation if these men could not quit? Why is it that the employers to-day are willing to meet the laborers before a mediation board? It is because the men can quit. Take away from the employee the power to quit and you will find every employer in this country refusing to arbitrate the question of conditions or of wages. That must be apparent to everyone. We have provisions for mediation, but it is not compulsory. The employees are not bound by it. Take away from labor the right to quit and what protection have they against starvation wages and intolerable conditions? What control do you provide over the employer? Is there any punishment for the imposition of starvation wages and death-dealing conditions?

You are conscripting labor. Are you ready to conscript the employer? I am ready to conscript both of them, but I am not ready to conscript the employee and not conscript the employer. I am not willing to say to the employee, "If you quit work you will injure the Government, and you will be guilty of a crime," and not say to the employer, "If you do not pay these men living wages and do not let them live under conditions that they can live under, you will be guilty of a crime." I do not believe in having an act that works on one class of people and not on another class of people.

All of us want to start up and hasten and expedite the manufacture of materials in this country necessary for the conduct of the war, but why start in with the employee? Why not go to the employer? Why not say, "You are partially responsible for some of these rows; you are partially responsible for some of these strikes; and we say to you that we will not only fix wages and hours of labor, but we will fix the conditions under which they are required to work?"

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. FALL. Is it not a fact that we have said to the employers engaged in work for the Government, or those in the line of Government work, that if they do not proceed with work to the full capacity of their plants we will take them over, if we choose, and operate them?

Mr. PITTMAN. Undoubtedly we have said to the employers under the direct supervision of the Government that if they do not proceed to do this work we will take them over; yet in the same voice, by striking out section 3, you wish to say, "You can work your labor as you see fit, for they can not quit." You want to permit the copper mines to say to their employees, "You have got to work for a certain wage; you have got to work for a certain number of hours; you have got to work under certain conditions; and you can not quit as a body, because if you do quit it will shut down this mine, and if you shut down this mine you will be guilty of a crime." That is exactly what this bill says. If you would deprive labor of its only protection, then, in the name of humanity, substitute some governmental protection in the same act. We need legislation that will make strikes not only impossible but unnecessary. Without section 3 this legislation is not only inhuman but is crude beyond description.

I have never known such an outrage as this bill will be if you strike out section 3 of this conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

RECESS.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I have been notified by some three or four Senators that they desire to speak on this subject. We can not finish the consideration of this report to-night; and therefore I am going to ask the Senate now to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., Wednesday, April 10, 1918) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, April 11, 1918, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 10, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. William Couden, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, Thy presence envelops us as a cloud. We can not penetrate all that life may mean; we never know all the dangers from which we are protected nor see all the opportunities which we might claim. But the mystery of our life in Thee is shot through with the light of never-failing love. We are amply blest. Yet with hope and faith in Thee we long for more. Teach us, dear Lord, to yield in all to Thee—to obey and trust, to sacrifice and wait, to work and rest. Dedicate to Thy purpose all our efforts and all that we hold dear. Continue Thy care and leading to each of us personally and to the needs of the world.

To-day comes to us a list of names who in high service have given life for our national honor and welfare. God accept them. Christ receive them. Encourage the wounded. Succor those left to carry on the conflict and all who are to go. And comfort the mourning and anxious hearts back home.

In this pregnant hour of history, when we are as those whose eyes watch for the morning, make it clear to all who love Thy appearing in our country and in the nations of our allies that Thou art our God and our Father. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3980) to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes.

COLLECTION OF SOLDIERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and many Members of Congress have been very much besieged by letters from people who have soldiers in the Army who have either died from natural causes or who have been killed. Shyster lawyers over the country have organized, as they usually do on occasions like this, to try to fleece these people out of a part of their insurance and a part of their compensation, trying to make them believe that it is necessary to employ a lawyer and pay him at least 10 per cent or something of that kind on the collection of their insurance and compensation. I desire to state that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported a bill to stop that practice, and I desire to give notice, in order that they may know what is coming up, that I shall ask unanimous consent this morning for the consideration of that bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman state the number of it?

Mr. RAYBURN. Eleven thousand two hundred and twenty-five.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DOWELL for one week, in order to take part in the liberty-loan campaign in Iowa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial inserted in the RECORD. It is from the New York American relative to the work of Secretary Daniels as Secretary of the Navy. There is a part of the editorial which is partisan, which I shall leave entirely out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the proper medium for an editorial of that sort is the Official Bulletin. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 10069, the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House

on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—ayes 69, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill, with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the rivers and harbors bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10069) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Maryland: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$300,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I have spoken upon the Baltimore Harbor so often that I take it most Members here to-day know a great deal about the harbor of our great metropolis lying within 40 miles of the National Capital.

Baltimore Harbor is composed of the Patapsco River, which is formed by the North and South Branches of that river. These branches rise in the central part of the State and the total length of the river is about 65 miles. Baltimore lies on the river, about 11 miles from the Chesapeake Bay. The river is only tidal for a few miles above the city. There was a time when the river was navigable to Elkridge Landing, but that has long since filled up. The important portion of the Patapsco River lies below the city of Baltimore and there is a detached part of the channel 4½ miles long into Chesapeake Bay—the Chesapeake Bay section opposite York Spit. The Curtis Bay section of the harbor is on the south side of the Patapsco River, about 6 miles southeasterly of the inner harbor. It is the mouth of Curtis Creek, in Anne Arundel County. This section of the harbor has been recently annexed by the General Assembly of Maryland to Baltimore. There is another section, known as Spring Gardens, which is really an extension of the Patapsco River into that part of the harbor known as Spring Gardens, and is about 4 miles long and half a mile wide.

The river changes entirely at Baltimore. Above it is a flowing stream, sometimes not more than 200 feet wide, while below it is an arm or outlet to the Chesapeake Bay from 1 to 4 miles wide. The tide in the river is slightly over 1 foot—about 14 inches.

When the United States Government began operations in the river there was a depth of 17-feet available at mean low tide. There were, of course, pockets which were deeper, but they availed nothing, inasmuch as the greater portion of the river was only 17 feet deep. In Curtis Bay there was an available depth of 20 feet at mean low water when we got to it, but that required another channel.

To-day there has been gradually appropriated sufficient sums of money to provide a channel 35 feet deep from the sea to Baltimore Harbor and into the harbor. York Spit Channel was dredged several years ago, but in the last few years, under a bill which I introduced, Congress provided \$326,000 for the widening of it to make it more available for large ships. I will introduce here a statement showing that up to this time some \$9,000,000 have been expended on those channels, which certainly shows effort on the part of Baltimore's Representatives:

Financial summary.

Amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1917, exclusive of receipts from sales, etc., formerly included, amounting to \$58.81:

New work.....	\$8,764,003.40
Maintenance.....	398,761.12
Total expended.....	9,162,764.52
Total appropriations to June 30, 1917.....	9,553,180.00

Fiscal year ending June 30.	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917
Expended for new work.....	\$59,847.65	\$75,512.74	\$229,739.76		
Expended for maintenance.....	200.00	5,581.46	27,279.45	\$22,100.71	\$42,681.94
Total expended.....	60,047.65	81,094.20	257,019.21	22,100.71	42,681.94
Appropriated or allotted.....	355,250.00				

July 1, 1916, balance unexpended.....	\$79,097.42
June 30, 1917, amount expended during fiscal year, for maintenance.....	42,681.94
July 1, 1917, balance unexpended.....	36,415.48
July 1, 1917, outstanding liabilities.....	1,150.00
July 1, 1917, balance available.....	35,265.48
Amount appropriated by river and harbor act approved Aug. 8, 1917.....	354,000.00
Amount available for fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.....	389,265.48
Amount (estimated) required to be appropriated for completion of existing project.....	626,100.00
Amount that can be profitably expended in fiscal year ending June 30, 1919:	
For new work.....	200,000.00
For maintenance.....	100,000.00
Total.....	300,000.00

At the last Congress the river and harbor bill carried a project for the Baltimore Harbor in the sum of \$876,100, and appropriations were made in the bill of last year and this year toward carrying out that project. The amount of the appropriation carried in this bill, to wit, \$300,000, is apparently small, but when we realize that we have a comfortable balance from the last bill, which will enable us to carry on the work without hesitancy and toward the completion of the project provided, we can not complain.

This project provided for surveying, deepening, and widening the channel into Spring Gardens to the Hanover Street Bridge, the dredging of a large anchor basin in the harbor opposite Fort McHenry, and the deepening and widening of Curtis Bay Channel into that section of the harbor. The improvement of the Patapsco River section, including York Spit, has been completed and maintained by dredging under previous projects, so that now we have a 35-foot channel from the city to the sea. Together with the harbor improvements made by Baltimore, we have 35 feet of water to the piers at Locust Point.

When the work of dredging under this project of the last bill is finally completed, which will naturally take several years and perhaps more if the war continues, we will have a harbor second to New York alone on the Atlantic seaboard.

We must not be content, however, with 35 feet of water when we realize the great draft of many boats which are now being constructed, especially when we realize that only last year we authorized the construction of several dreadnaughts 850 feet long, drawing 31½ feet of water, and having a tonnage of 40,000 tons. It might be possible with a 35-foot channel to get one of these boats in the harbor in good condition, but if she was injured it would require more than that amount of water.

It is clearly apparent that unless we have more than 35 feet of water within the next 10 years we will be practically out of the running. New York has a project under way for a 40-foot channel, Norfolk likewise by virtue of its navy yard and dry dock has been authorized 40 feet, and only to-day by amendment a channel has been provided for Charleston, S. C., to her navy yard, at that place, of 40 feet. Philadelphia and Baltimore, it will be seen, in a few years will be practically out of the race as almost the only large seaports along the Atlantic which have not secured 40 feet.

Philadelphia will no doubt obtain what she desires by virtue of its League Island Navy Yard, and it is strictly up to Baltimore, in order to keep in the running, to procure a 40-foot channel from the city to the sea.

I have introduced a bill for this purpose, and while I shall not press it upon this committee to-day as an amendment, I hope and believe that the next rivers and harbors bill will at least contain a survey for that purpose. I wish to impress it upon the House and upon my people that Baltimore, in order keep astride with the other great cities, must have a 40-foot channel, and it will require constant effort and determination in order to procure it.

Mr. LITTLE. Is the gentleman advising his friends to send their shipments to Baltimore?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I advise everybody who wants a thing done quickly and cheaply to go to Baltimore. Baltimore at the present time has developed into a great shipbuilding center. All along the coast down to the Patapsco River are located great shipbuilding yards. The Bethlehem Steel Co. has developed a plant in which they are expending \$50,000,000 in improvements and enlargements. As gentlemen know, the House recently appropriated some \$50,000,000, \$5,000,000 of which will be spent in building homes for workmen. The great Baltimore Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. have extended their plant; they occupy a part of Fort McHenry Grounds, and have now gone on the other side of the fort, but outside, and developed another large plant. Along the banks of the Patapsco, below Curtis Creek, a shipbuilding company, with a capital of \$3,000,000, has been incorpo-

rated and will be in operation I hope before long; in addition, numerous other plants have been established.

Like Philadelphia, Baltimore has become a great shipbuilding center. Great ordnance warehouses are being built in Curtis Bay, across the harbor from Baltimore. So we are getting along pretty well in Baltimore, and I only wanted to call attention to the fact that we appreciate the \$300,000 given us, which with the balance on hand enables us to continue work. There was an authorization of \$876,100 altogether.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is evidently not complaining of the way that the committee has treated Baltimore?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; but I wish the appropriation could have been larger and more work done. There has not been much work done by the Government during the last year; but we make no complaint, for, as a rule, Congress has been fairly good to us; but every dollar spent at Baltimore has been of great advantage to the Government. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I made a speech two or three years ago in favor of the new immigration station. That new station has enabled the Government to have one of the largest hospitals in the country for the treatment of the injured during this war. It has been turned into a hospital and, with other buildings, will have 2,000 beds.

Mr. WINGO. I do not want the gentleman to misinterpret my question. I am with the gentleman because, like other Members, we realize that when the gentleman goes for something he is generally so persistent that they have to give it to him sooner or later, and the gentleman gets what he wants. He has a remarkable ability to present the merits of his proposition, and he never presents one to the House that does not possess merit, and for that reason the House is generally with him.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, we have to keep busy. The great western sections and the port of New York swallow up things. Only yesterday we provided for a 40-foot channel through Hell Gate for New York. I want to call attention to the fact that there are other ports on the seaboard besides New York that ought to have a 40-foot channel. There is Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and I shall ask in due time for a 40-foot channel for Baltimore.

Mr. TREADWAY. Did the gentleman include Boston?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I included Boston to-day and also in my remarks of yesterday.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the question asked by the gentleman from Arkansas struck the nail on the head. Members of the House convey the impression that through their individual efforts they have something to do with the merits of the various propositions. If we could only get away from that view and understand that it is the merit of the proposition itself on a commercial basis for which we give these appropriations, it would be better. We have got to do that before we will ever get anything that will be fair to the country and fair to the Treasury of the United States.

As to Baltimore and the necessities of that harbor, I do not wish to criticize the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], for he is an excellent Member and looks after matters connected with his district, but this appropriation was determined irrespective of his argument, and it ought to be determined irrespective of the argument of Members of the House. If not, it is unfair to other Members, and Congress ought not to give to those who are specially favored and present matters with especial persistency. They should not have any advantage over others. For that reason I speak. I do not think it is right that Members should assume that it is their individual effort which secures these appropriations.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I merely want to say that the reason I did not take up more time of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors during the formation of this bill is that the project at Baltimore for \$876,000 had already been adopted. It was adopted last year, and there was no necessity for further proof, as it then became a continued proposition.

Mr. FREAR. Yes; it was unnecessary, because the committee has full knowledge of Baltimore Harbor, and it has given what she needs irrespective of the wishes of the gentleman. Now, the same is true of most of the harbors and ought to be of our navigable facilities, and I speak of this for fear a wrong impression may go out as to what influences the committee. It may, but it ought not. We ought to be governed entirely by the commercial needs.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt, I desire to say there is no formal amendment pending before the House and at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Maryland I would like to demand the regular order to proceed.

Mr. PRICE. I rise, Mr. Chairman, more particularly to get some information from the chairman of the committee who reported this bill. I notice on page 4 there are about 25 rivers and creeks in my district which carry a maintenance of \$3,000. I would say this seems so small, so inadequate, for so many rivers that I simply wanted to know on what this estimate is based.

Mr. SMALL. In reply to the gentleman I will say that the only item in that group for which an appropriation is recommended is the one for Wicomico River, where there is an estimate for \$3,000 for maintenance. As to all the other items in that group, no recommendation for an appropriation was made, either because the balance on hand was sufficient for the next fiscal year or because no money is needed for their maintenance. Take, for instance, Wicomico River. There is a balance available there of \$3,694, and this sum, together with the cash appropriation of \$3,000 carried in this bill, was regarded as sufficient for the present year and the next fiscal year. Every dollar is appropriated for the group of items which was recommended by the Chief of Engineers as being required for their maintenance or improvement.

Mr. PRICE. I understand, then, there is an unexpended balance to take care of the maintenance of those rivers?

Mr. SMALL. There is \$60,000 altogether available for the group.

Mr. PRICE. I simply wanted to clear that up because it seemed so small that I wanted to know whether they were properly provided for.

Mr. SMALL. It is a perfectly proper inquiry on the part of the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman thoroughly understands the importance of the rivers in this part of the country. This whole eastern shore of Maryland is cut up with rivers and creeks; in fact, it is the only means of transportation that many sections of that country have; and, in fact, two-thirds of the commerce of that section is carried on those rivers and creeks. I thank the gentleman for his information and am very glad he feels it is provided for so adequately.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Va.: Continuing improvement, \$1,540,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out line 20 on page 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Improvement and for maintenance, including the channel to Newport News, \$1,940,000," so the paragraph as amended will read as follows: "Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Va.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including the channel to Newport News, \$1,940,000."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, in the project for Norfolk Harbor and channels are included, first, Norfolk Harbor, embracing the Elizabeth River; also the Southern Branch of that river, on which the navy yard is located, and the Eastern Branch and the Western Branch of Elizabeth River. Another project in this group is Thimble Shoal Channel, while still another is the channel leading from Hampton Roads to Newport News. In the annual report of the Chief of Engineers recommendations of appropriation were only made for Norfolk Harbor in further continuance of the improvement of the deeper channel of 45 feet to the navy yard and also for the Thimble Shoal Channel. No estimate was submitted at that time for the channel leading from Hampton Roads to Newport News. This additional appropriation of \$400,000 is for the maintenance and further improvement of the channel to Newport News and is offered in response to a letter from the Chief of Engineers, which I will send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letter will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, April 8, 1918.

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: I. Referring to the item on page 4 of the pending river and harbor bill for Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Va., I have the honor to state that information has just been received from the district engineer showing that work is urgently needed on the Newport

News Channel for which no provision was made in the estimate as submitted in the annual report for 1917. The existing project for this channel provides for a depth of 35 feet and widening the former project width of 400 feet to 600 feet.

2. No allotment to this channel was made from the appropriation of August 8, 1917, because the 40-foot channel to the navy yard was considered more important. Similarly, in the estimates for the next fiscal year it was deemed advisable to limit the funds to the work that could be done on the channel to the navy yard, no special urgency for work on the Newport News Channel having appeared at that time. Recently, however, the local pilots' association and the commander of the port of embarkation have reported that the largely increased use of this channel for war purposes has developed its inadequacy to serve these needs. The district engineer concurs in their views and recommends that provision be made in this bill for widening this channel to the new project width of 600 feet.

3. The original estimated cost of this work was \$270,000. The channel has shoaled, however, since that estimate was made, and there has been a notable increase in prices, so that the district engineer now estimates the cost of this work at \$400,000. In view of these conditions, it is recommended that the item for continuing improvement of Norfolk Harbor and Channels, Va., be increased from \$1,540,000 to \$1,940,000.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

Mr. SMALL. Unless some further information is requested—

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does this project for which the gentleman has recommended an increase of \$400,000 involve the improvement of the channel to the Newport News training station, which the Government secured under authorization made last year?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; it makes that accessible, including the great shipyard there and the supply depot. It is a very important harbor for the shipment of supplies abroad to our expeditionary forces.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is virtually one of the important points for the embarkation of our troops going abroad.

Mr. SMALL. Probably the most important save Philadelphia and New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand this additional appropriation it is for the purpose of improving the channel leading up to the new naval station, which was secured by authorization of Congress last year?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is correct, and this is asked as a war exigency. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: Continuing improvement, \$500,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4 strike out the period at the end of line 25 and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following words: "Provided, That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, make such minor changes in the location of the waterway as he may deem advisable in the interest of navigation."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I make this statement in connection with this amendment: The district engineer, in making a survey there, has decided that in the interest of economy in construction and maintenance there ought to be a slight deviation in the line as heretofore recommended in the report on the project. This amendment simply authorizes such slight deviation as may be necessary in the interest of economy and navigation.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to oppose this amendment, because the item of \$500,000 was offered in the committee and it was opposed there, and I am satisfied to let the committee's action stand. But I do wish to make this brief statement in reference to this project, which I have opposed in the past and which I do not believe to-day is of any commercial importance, particularly in war times. As I have stated in my minority report, the commerce has dwindled down forty-odd per cent within the last two years on this project. This \$500,000 proposed in the bill is to meet underestimates made by the Army engineers on this canal or waterway. And it ought to be understood that when these estimates are made and they are accepted so easily by the House we will ask what are the facts. Think of it, in just one year we are confronted with the fact that half a million dollars in underestimates by Army engineers has occurred on this waterway. The amendment seeks to have the Army engineers make changes if they choose. They are permitted to do that, I suppose, anyway. They have had before them various routes for years in order to determine where to send these barges up and down the coast and where to dig canals. I wish to call attention to the fact that here is an appropriation of half a million dollars due to underestimates and mistakes of the engineers in digging on this waterway along the Atlantic coast. But what are several millions of dollars for this

part of the waterway? It will run over \$6,000,000 when you put in these underestimates, and we do not know how many more underestimates we will have before it is completed. Bear in mind that within the last two years there has been 40 per cent loss in commerce, and yet as a war measure you are putting in half a million dollars. And this is only a small link in an inland waterway scheme that will reach many hundreds of millions of dollars as now proposed and is of no practicable commercial demand or use.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who moved to strike out the last word.

I am in favor of the amendment and hope it will be adopted. I realize the gentleman from Wisconsin has made a fight for several years on what may be the canal items in this bill, and he has his reasons therefor. I have given him credit for a conscientious desire to do his full duty in the House, but I question whether it can be truly said that the opening up of the inside waterways along the Atlantic coast at this time is not directly in the line of war necessity. With the facts staring us in the face that the railroads have been unable to carry the freight of the country and to meet the requirements of war, it has seemed to me to be close to suicidal to permit our inside waterways to remain inactive as they have been.

It has been pointed out on this floor time and time again—the older Members know it well, but it may be repeated for the benefit of the new Members—that the inside waterways along the Atlantic coast need but a little digging here and a little digging there to connect them up in one continuous chain along the coast—an inside water course safe from the dangers of the ocean, capable of carrying a barge traffic, and if sufficient depth be given capable of carrying vessels of war inside, protected from storm and free to move about strategically as they see fit.

We do not build navy yards out on the ocean line. Neither do we build ships out in the ocean. We use inland areas for that purpose, and we must have inside passageways through which vessels may come and go. They are not constructed directly on the coast. They are constructed inside.

I gave you yesterday the most notable example we have in the United States to-day of progress along an inside waterway when I referred to the Delaware River. But wonderful as has been the development along that river in recent years, it is limited in its capacity to relieve the Government at this time, because we have deliberately refused to open up connecting links that would make it serviceable to the country—South and North. Gentlemen look querulously at the map and say, "You have got the great ocean to go upon." But gentlemen fail to read in the newspapers in times of stress and storm in the winter season of barges that ought to be on inside waterways attempting to make the outside passage and going to the bottom, carrying human lives along with them.

Mr. STAFFORD. The canals are frozen.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Wisconsin says canals are frozen.

Mr. FREAR. I did not say that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there are other gentlemen from Wisconsin here besides the gentleman who spoke last. The gentleman [Mr. STAFFORD], who dreams in terms of ice, comes from Milwaukee, where they need it in the familiar beverages they drink. But no one needs to remind even the school children of the United States that in certain periods of the year ice comes over the streams of the Northern States. No one need hurl into the face of the merest tyro the statement that canals and waterways and lakes will be frozen. Why, navigation on the Great Lakes, up yonder where the gentleman from Wisconsin lives, is impeded for long seasons during the year on account of ice, and the boats are held up in the harbors, whereas boats can continue to navigate the inside waterways south of Wisconsin, if you will only open up the courses. That simple truth needs no demonstration.

One of the real hindrances to the progress of this war is the failure of this country to properly utilize and operate the navigable waterways that the Lord has given it. Gentlemen remember well the coal shortage of a month ago. They remember how congestion backed up against the port of New York. They were told then that if these waterways had been improved and these barge lines had been encouraged, the storehouses of the Nation might have been full at various points rather than at the one port of New York alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Gentlemen vote very properly—

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Wisconsin is boasting about the Lakes. Is it not a fact that navigation is safe on the canals while they are continuing to drown people on the Lakes?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad the gentleman from Kansas has brought that to the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The gentleman cares only for life on the Great Lakes. I care also for human life along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say again I was not referring to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. The other gentleman from Wisconsin seems to be peculiarly amused when this question of saving life on the Atlantic seaboard arises.

Mr. FREAR. Before our committee Col. Keller testified briefly as follows, and it is right in line with the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is no more important war proposition than this.

Mr. FREAR. He says, on page 13 of the inland waterway investigation:

The railroad freight rate per ton from the anthracite fields to Philadelphia, where that coal might be transhipped to barges and from Philadelphia going to Norfolk by water, is within 50 cents or thereabouts of the rail rate to Norfolk.

Mr. FREAR. What proportion of the haul?

Col. KELLER. About a third. Now, then, that determines what the barge shall get. The man who is buying coal in Norfolk is willing to allow the barge only the difference between the railroad through rate to Norfolk and the railroad local rate to Philadelphia—that is, 50 cents. The result is that the coal does not move by water. The barges have gone out of this coal business. This is the short-sightedness of the people. They do not fight against railroad rates when in normal times these rates favor the individual at the expense of the community. When things are abnormal, however, these rates may militate against the individual as well and damage his interests. We come back to the point that there is no prospect of large traffic on inland waterways until the rail situation is very radically revised.

That is the Army engineer who appeared before our committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad the gentleman quoted that. I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if he agrees the canals have gone out of business and are not carrying coal in the manner indicated by Col. Keller?

Mr. FREAR. There may be some canals that are carrying some coal, but I will read also in regard to the New York Barge Canal, if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman has read enough for the purposes of the argument. The gentleman has read far enough to prove what I am stating, that these very canals have been put out of business by the railroads, although they were built to serve the country at cheaper rates than the railroads were. The railroads did not encourage the canals. I will point to the Schuylkill Navigation Canal, which was put out of business, although it proposed to bring coal to the consumer for \$1 cheaper per ton than it could be brought by rail. Yet the gentleman from Wisconsin insists that is not a good system, and although the railroads themselves to-day are pleading for the rehabilitation of the canals, he would not have them restored but would continue to impose these exorbitant rates upon the consumers of coal. I want no better illustration than that which the gentleman has presented. I will tell him that if we had a canal free of tolls between the Chesapeake and the Delaware Bays now there would probably not be railroad embargoes on lumber from the South that is needed in the shipyards of the North. We would get that lumber up through the canals. We can not get it outside because our ships are commandeered. The schooners that used to carry it are out of business. Barges are not built for ocean-going traffic, and you refuse to permit the inside waterways to be used because you demand that the railroads shall be the sole carriers of the traffic of the country.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion on a lateral canal like the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, that brings coal down from Cumberland.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. Gentlemen have laughed at that proposition. They have sneered at the thought that we should utilize the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. It is not along that coastal chain that I have been advocating here, but it is one of the many feeders of that great inland trunk line, and would aid and be aided by it. If the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal had not been

chloroformed by the railroads there would have been plenty of coal in Washington last winter, when the people of Washington were begging for coal. That is the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, may I ask for five minutes to respond to what the gentleman has said?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman from Philadelphia dreams on this subject of inland waterways. He is at the head of an organization that is urging generous appropriations for canals and inland waterways. He is present at all the waterway meetings and he derides and criticizes people who disagree with him upon this subject. Now, when it is pointed out to him, the absurdity of his own argument made upon this floor in regard to the shipment of coal on this very waterway, upon which we have put now over \$3,000,000 on this short link, and we will put \$100,000,000, and far more than that, on this Atlantic coast waterway scheme—aye, a billion dollars, if you choose, if we get it deep enough to carry large vessels—with all these facts submitted to him by the Army engineers, he says that we are glad of failure of usefulness, or substantially that; that that is the position we assume. It is not.

The fact is, I fear, that the gentleman is taking up a narrow-minded view on this inland-waterway proposition. We have got to change the rates of the railroads before traffic will seek the canals. I have insisted upon it while he has remained silent. Why does he not go before the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why does he not go before Mr. McAdoo or somebody else on this proposition?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have gone before Mr. McAdoo, and am happy to say that Mr. McAdoo has promised to utilize the waterways wherever they can be utilized to advantage.

Mr. FREAR. I hope that is true. I have seen the gentleman's picture repeatedly in publications along the vicinity of the canal, wherever he makes his appearance and conducts his investigations.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not that show the demand for this improvement on the part of the people in those localities?

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman, with his charming personality, is sure to get this publicity. I am discussing coal, and I am showing, Mr. Chairman, that, notwithstanding all the millions of dollars that we have put into this waterway, the Army engineer, in whose judgment you are so frequently asked to give confidence, says there is nothing in it. He says that coal barges are withdrawn because we can carry coal cheaper by rail on account of the 50 cents per ton allowed for differential. That is the reason. It is useless to put millions of dollars into these waterways, as we are now doing, unless we have some intelligent idea of the way to utilize them. The same thing applies to the Mississippi River, on which we have appropriated \$170,000,000. What is the use in wasting millions of dollars on the Mississippi River when we have no commerce on the Mississippi River? Col. Keller is a very able engineer and he has a very intelligent understanding of the situation, in my view. He says you have got to raise rates on the railroads if you are to utilize these waterways.

We have disclosed and brought it home to you how much we have appropriated. We have appropriated for three rivers \$250,000,000, for the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio, with a small commerce which has decreased materially since so-called improvements were begun.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I understood you to quote the engineers as saying you have got to reach the railroad rates before you can utilize these streams. That means you have got to reduce railroad rates?

Mr. FREAR. No. You have got to raise the rates so that it will make it possible for waterways traffic to exist. They have done it in Germany. The reason why they have made it successful in Germany is because the Government controls both railways and waterways.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is not that success partly due to the fact that certain classes of freight, where expedition is not essential, are carried on the waterways? Is not that true of bulky freight and the cheaper freight?

Mr. FREAR. I would like to explain to the gentleman in detail what occurs practically only on one river in Germany, namely, the Rhine, where river commerce is over 30,000,000

tons annually; and the conditions there are so entirely different from those on any streams we have in this country that it is almost impossible to duplicate them, except where the Government has control of rivers and railways, in order to force certain commerce onto the rivers by raising the railway rates. That is about the only way we can do it, and, as the gentleman says, it is for a certain class of heavy traffic—ore, coal, and bulk freight. Of course, on the Rhine River the coal is at the opposite end of the stream than on our own rivers. The mountains furnish, through snows, some moisture the year round. With us, on the Mississippi and other rivers, in the summer time the waterways are practically useless and largely unused the year round.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Canals are not.

Mr. FREAR. But the expense of the canalization system is too great. We have put \$59,000,000 into the Ohio River appropriations already for canalization and the commerce is not as great as it was before we began the improvements. On the Brazos River, down in the gentleman's own country, and on the Trinity River, into which they have put three or four million dollars, there is no tonnage whatever.

Mr. SLAYDEN. But the improvements have not been completed.

Mr. FREAR. No; and if we put in as much as \$12,000,000, as we have on the Black Warrior River, the Army engineer says, in effect, in this report that it is useless, that you can not compel people to build boats to carry the commerce or to float commerce when railway facilities are so superior.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not want the money spent on streams where navigation can not be developed.

Mr. FREAR. I am satisfied the gentleman does not, and Congress does not, and if we will give intelligent study to this question I think we will come to a realization of the fact that it is a misuse of the money to make such appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be left in the attitude before the House of urging appropriations for streams where it is not possible to ever develop navigation; but in my travels I have observed that the canals and streams are enormously used, in Belgium, for example, and in Holland, and in some places in Germany, and in France, too. I believe that there are certain classes of freight that will be transported by water whenever there is an opportunity to do so.

Now, as to the Brazos and the Trinity, I do not know whether it is possible to make those streams fit for navigation. That is out of my line of study and investigation. I am compelled to accept the professional opinion of people who are trained in such matters. But it is not quite fair for my friend to cite the present amount of commerce on those rivers in connection with his argument, because neither of those projects has been completed. Of course, commerce has not been built up since the undertaking was initiated to increase the navigability of those streams. His argument would be strong enough if the work on those streams had been finished and no commerce developed, but now it is not finished, and so there is no strength in his argument. That is all I have to say about that.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin is particularly opposing this improvement.

Mr. FREAR. I am not, and I ask to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SMALL. But, for the sake of accuracy, I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin would like to be informed as to the commerce on this section of the Norfolk-Beaufort waterway, from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound. There was a decrease of only 47,848 tons in 1916 from the previous year, or a decrease of only 9 per cent in tonnage. Or the contrary, there was an increase in the value of the commerce of \$404,661 for the same period. I have made the calculation, and I am sure the gentleman would like to have the facts correctly stated.

Mr. FREAR. I quoted from page 542 of the 1917 report of the engineer that the loss in commerce between 1913 and 1916 was 45 per cent. Is that statement correct?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman will understand that between Norfolk and Albemarle Sound there are two waterways.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman includes the inland waterway via Dismal Swamp Canal?

Mr. SMALL. Yes. The United States have purchased the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal route and the same is now under improvement in accordance with the report of the engineers.

Mr. FREAR. That explains the discrepancy. This is from the report.

Mr. SMALL. One of these waterways has been taken over by the Government and is under improvement, and while it is under improvement it can be used very little. The bulk of the commerce still has to go through the privately owned water-

way, on which tolls are charged, and it is fair to compile the commerce on both the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal and the Dismal Swamp Canal, because both have the same termini—that is to say, both extend from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. We all realize that this project is very dear to the heart of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], as it is, of course, to the gentleman from Philadelphia, who is the perennial president of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association. I would like to inquire of the gentleman as to whether he can inform the House of the character of the tonnage on this inland waterway and the ton-miles of the traffic that is carried on it?

Mr. SMALL. In answer to that I will say that it is all through commerce. It passes the entire distance through. None of it is local in the sense the gentleman has in mind; that is to say, going a few miles. It is all through commerce, and it is of a diversified character, consisting of coal, fertilizers, gasoline, agricultural products, forest products, grain, merchandise, and miscellaneous articles.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the total tonnage is how much?

Mr. SMALL. The total tonnage for 1916, the last figures we have, was 524,475 tons, at a valuation of \$15,032,097.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to the character of the vessels used in the carriage of this tonnage, whether they are steam propelled?

Mr. SMALL. The larger part of the transportation is in barges, but a substantial part is also carried in freight steamers.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the project, the recommended depth is 9 feet.

Mr. SMALL. No; it is 12 feet, with a width of 90 feet at the bottom and a width of 150 feet at the top.

Mr. STAFFORD. Other than the gentleman from the eighteenth ward of Philadelphia, the distinguished president of the Inland Waterways Association, is there any thought of making an inland waterway deep enough so as to have it possible to transport men-of-war?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I do not want to have the gentleman's words taken down, but I ask if it is permissible to refer to a Member in the first person?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if I have any time remaining I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. My point of order is that the gentleman from Wisconsin is violating the rules in referring to his colleague in the first person.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take exception to the position of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the president of the Inland Waterways Association. I have not, as the report of the proceedings will show, referred to any gentleman, not even the illustrious gentleman from Pennsylvania, the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the first person. I have referred to him always in the third person. I would not magnify the ego by referring to him in the first person. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I accept the humble apology of the gentleman from Wisconsin. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I now apologize to the House for having committed an error in respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, to whom I referred a little while ago. When I spoke of the gentleman from Wisconsin as having paid little attention to waterways I was referring to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], who usually is very accurate in other matters. But the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], coming with special force to the aid of his colleague, entered the fray and seemed to take to himself the suggestion that I had reflected upon him. I have observed in the list of Members from Wisconsin that there is more than one Member from Wisconsin in the delegation, and several of them are of considerable prominence in this House, so that when reference is made to any one of them perhaps it would be better, the rules permitting, to designate them by name.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman say that as far as the delegation from Pennsylvania is concerned, and particularly when matters pertaining to the city of Philadelphia are under consideration?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. With humble apologies to my colleague I admit that there are gentlemen in the Pennsylvania delegation who do their best for their country and their State; in fact, all of them do, as I assume that all of the gentlemen from Wisconsin do. The trouble is that when a Member refers to "the gentleman from Wisconsin" a large part of the delegation rises with one accord. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] mistook my reference to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as

having reference to him. Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], to whom I did not refer, indicated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania sometimes, because of his enthusiasm for waterways, became abusive. That statement ought not to stand without contradiction.

I have never been abusive to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have been lenient to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have been observant of his weaknesses. I have seen that the gentleman from Wisconsin is fair up to a certain point, and then stops without ascertaining all the facts. The gentleman from Wisconsin says the gentleman from Pennsylvania gets his picture in the papers along the Atlantic coast, but the gentleman from Wisconsin gets display headlines in the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. FREAR. May I inquire of the gentleman when this occurred?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have observed that when the gentleman makes a spectacular speech on the floor it appears the next morning in the Chicago Tribune, and as that paper has a wide circulation throughout the State of Wisconsin I assume that a Wisconsin speech in the Chicago Tribune is good for home consumption.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman will agree with me when I say that the Chicago Tribune, of all the papers in this country, has helped defeat or modify some of the bad river and harbor bills in the past, and that was done on its own motion, and it has been a matter of national concern.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has encouraged the gentleman from Wisconsin to go on and make his statements about eastern projects and projects elsewhere. It has given encouragement through display headlines. That may be "according to Hoyle"; gentlemen in Congress are permitted to do that sort of thing if they want to. There are gentlemen on the other side of the House who come in suddenly and make spectacular speeches about their colleagues and then rush off on the lecture platform. But other gentlemen are content to make speeches about waterways, waste, and extravagance, and they get the headlines in the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. BRITTEN. In reply to my good friend from Texas [Mr. EAGLE], I would like to say that there is probably not one man in the House who is here oftener or who spends more time in the House than the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is another case of mistaken personality. [Laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I have called the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has ignored the report of the Army engineers. He has never replied to it, he can not reply to it, because it is so convincing in itself. It says that the barges along this canal have been withdrawn because coal can not be shipped profitably.

As to the further suggestion in regard to the proposition that we have here—this waterway—I have not made a motion to strike it out, although, as I have shown, \$500,000 additional cost was occasioned through the mistake of engineers, and, as I said, every coal barge has been withdrawn. No coal has been shipped notwithstanding the enthusiastic promises of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I shall continue to stand here and explain what these facts are, supported by the Army engineers' reports, which he has heretofore generally accepted. I have no personal feeling in regard to the matter, but I shall not permit myself to be misrepresented.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. SMALL. Can we not have a vote upon this amendment?

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to make a speech upon it.

Mr. SMALL. Then I ask unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed.

Mr. MADDEN. And I ask that that be made 10 minutes. I modify the request to make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] modifies that request and asks unanimous consent that debate be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman himself to consume that time?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SMALL. I accept the modification.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that he may proceed for 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, we are considering the item on page 4, lines 24 and 25:

Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.: Continuing improvement, \$500,000.

According to the minority views, this \$500,000 indicates an underestimate of the cost of the improvement, and the minority of the committee make this statement, which is published on page 12 of the minority views:

A proposed inland-waterway project along the Atlantic coast and Gulf that canalizes marshes, sounds, creeks, and dry land, at a possible expense to the Government of from \$100,000,000 to ten times that amount, depending on depth, is being vigorously urged upon Congress and upon war boards as a war measure. This bill contains \$500,000, because of mistaken estimated expense on one section of a canal or waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort. After appropriations of \$3,244,400 to June 30, 1917, in addition to the half million dollars of underestimates, \$2,397,180 more will be required for this canal waterway that lost 45 per cent of its small commerce between 1913 and 1916, according to page 542 of the 1917 Engineers' report.

I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, in charge of the bill, if the statement in the minority views which I have just read is true? I do not pretend to know the facts.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, a short time ago, while perhaps the gentleman was diverted—

Mr. MADDEN. I was not present.

Mr. SMALL. I stated in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] in effect that that statement was erroneous, and I explained why it was. As a matter of fact, there has been a falling off of only about 9 per cent, the decrease being 47,848 tons, while there has been an increase in valuation of the commerce of \$404,661.

Mr. MADDEN. So that the total tonnage, according to the gentleman from North Carolina, has fallen off 9 per cent, while the value of the tonnage which passes through the canal has increased.

Mr. SMALL. More than \$400,000.

Mr. MADDEN. What does the gentleman from Wisconsin say?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, the facts are just as stated here, taken from the official report, and the explanation of the chairman of the committee is that part of this commerce which he counts in goes around by an inland canal not owned by the Government.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I want to get at the facts.

Mr. SMALL. This matter has been explained quite often, but I am sure the gentleman will not object to its being explained again. The first section of the waterway from Norfolk to Beaufort Inlet under improvement is that section from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound. There are two waterways from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound, one known as the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal route and the other as the Dismal Swamp route, both having the same termini.

And, therefore, in taking into consideration the commerce between the two termini you must of necessity consider the commerce upon both. Now, the engineers recommended taking over the Albemarle & Chesapeake route. During the construction of that section along the Albemarle & Chesapeake Canal route naturally navigation has been obstructed and therefore not so large a commerce now goes through the Government-owned waterway as upon the other privately owned waterway; but when the Government's own waterway is completed, which will probably be by the end of the year, then all the commerce will go through the Government-owned and free waterway; so the figures I gave as to commerce represented the commerce upon both of those waterways, both the Government-owned and the privately owned, both having the same termini. When the public waterway from Norfolk to Albemarle Sound is completed all the commerce will use this route because it is free and will have ample depth and width. In the meantime, in estimating the commerce, it is only fair to combine the commerce on both routes.

Mr. MADDEN. So that while the gentleman from Wisconsin makes a charge in this report, and this charge I understand is based on the report of the engineers of 45 per cent—

Mr. SMALL. Of the Government-owned waterway, only one.

Mr. MADDEN. That 45 per cent of the tonnage on the Government-owned waterway has been lost. The gentleman from North Carolina states there was a decrease only of 9 per

cent of the combined tonnage on both waterways in 1916 from the previous year. Is that right?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I assume we pay tolls on the privately owned waterway?

Mr. SMALL. That is true, because the Government-owned waterway is under improvement and can not be used by loaded barges and steamers.

Mr. MADDEN. It was constructed before we began to appropriate the money, I assume, or it would not have been carrying a larger tonnage than now.

Mr. SMALL. I will say this route selected by the Government of the United States—the Albemarle and Chesapeake route—had deteriorated while the other one had been better maintained.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman means the privately owned waterway has been better maintained?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Assuming both statements are correct, notwithstanding there is a loss of tonnage of 9 per cent?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; that is true. That is the very best statement that can be made—that there is 9 per cent loss of tonnage, regardless of whether you carry through one or two waterways.

Mr. FESS. That is the point.

Mr. MADDEN. If you make the calculation on the one which is owned by the Government of the United States, and upon which we have already expended \$3,244,000, and upon which we expect to expend, in addition thereto, \$2,397,800, we have lost 45 per cent, and added to those two items we still have \$500,000 proposed to be expended through authority of the pending law, which is an addition to the two items I have named; so we will still find ourselves in the position of having expended over \$6,000,000 to bolster up a constantly decaying public institution. Now, my theory is that in the expenditure of public money we ought to have in mind the development for which the money is being expended; that we ought not under any circumstances to expend these vast sums where the evidence is clear we are spending the money on an obsolete institution.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will be delighted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How much money does the gentleman say has been spent?

Mr. MADDEN. Three million two hundred and forty-four thousand dollars, June 30, 1917.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And how much is to be expended?

Mr. MADDEN. Two million three hundred and ninety-seven thousand eight hundred dollars, in addition to the \$500,000 herein authorized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That large sum of money having been spent on work that is still under construction, would the gentleman stop here and waste all that has been done?

Mr. MADDEN. I will illustrate. I recall very clearly a case where I installed a large amount of machinery which cost about \$500,000. It was up-to-date machinery on the day it was installed. I discovered after the installation of this machinery that it did not produce the results which it was intended to produce when the investment was made. It was thought wise to scrap that machinery and substitute other machinery that would produce the desired results more economically. It was scrapped, the new machinery was installed, and the economy anticipated resulted from the change. If private interests will do such things, why should the Government not do likewise? Waste of money on obsolete facilities is never justified, not even out of the country's Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Waterways between Charleston and Alligator Creek (opposite McClellanville), S. C.: For maintenance, including branch to Morrisons Landing, \$5,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, or some member of it, in reference to this item of \$5,000 for the maintenance of branch to Morrisons Landing, which landing is apparently on a waterway between Charleston and Alligator Creek, opposite McClellanville. What sort of branch is this, a canal or a river?

Mr. SMALL. That is through a natural waterway 47½ miles long. I will say to the gentleman that the project provides for

a channel 4 feet deep at mean low water and 60 feet wide—I am reading from the report of the Engineers, page 638—60 feet wide at bottom between Charleston and a point opposite McClellanville, with a branch channel of the same dimensions to Morrisons Landing in McClellanville. The gentleman will find also on page 637, at the bottom, under commercial statistics, that this waterway while carrying comparatively a small tonnage occupies a very important relation to the local commerce of that section.

Mr. WALSH. Then, I understand \$12,000 has been expended by way of maintenance upon this branch during the year ending June 30, 1917?

Mr. SMALL. The amount expended during last year was \$12,179, which was expended in dredging—the gentleman will find on page 638, under the paragraph entitled "Operations and results during the fiscal year"—in dredging and restoring the branch channel leading to McClellanville, which had been filled as the result of an unusual storm on July 15, 1916. Dredging was also done to restore, as fully as practicable, project dimensions in the channel at Salt Pond Creek, Santee Pass, Grays Bay, and Sewee Bay. The total amount expended was as I have stated.

Mr. WALSH. Now, Mr. Chairman, a further inquiry. I notice in this project, and a great many others of probably similar character, that it requires a great number of appropriations of larger and smaller sums each year for maintenance. Why can not these small connecting links in these inland waterways be so constructed or so improved that the cost of maintenance will be reduced? In other words, why can not we make a lump-sum appropriation of \$50,000, or more, if necessary, to so dredge out or repair or reconstruct these small creeks or rivers of not very great depth in a way as to not require this constant appropriation for maintenance? Can the gentleman explain what there is peculiar about it?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman has asked a very pertinent and appropriate question. The matter of maintenance of channels of necessity varies, dependent upon the physical conditions. Take a channel, for instance, that is dredged 100 feet wide and 10 feet deep through a body of water a mile or 5 miles wide, and the gentleman will understand that through wave action or other action of the water there is of necessity a certain erosion on the side of the dredged channel into the channel itself, and the only way it can be removed is by annual dredging. Now, the stability of a channel depends also on the character of the soil. A sandy channel erodes very easily and fills up. Rather strange to say, a channel composed of mud is more stable than one of sand, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like just one minute more in which to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time will be extended one minute.

Mr. SMALL. Of course, with a bottom of clay the channel is even more stable. Where the channel is sufficiently narrow or where it is an artificial channel, and erodes or shoals or fills up, there the channel can be maintained by the process of revetment. But that is only practicable where the channel is narrow and only embraces the limits of the navigable channel itself.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what is done with the dredged material? Is it piled upon the banks, or is it deposited in other portions of the creek or shallow bay?

Mr. SMALL. Now, where the material is soft the dredging is usually done by hydraulic dredges, and the material is carried by pipes to the side of the stream and deposited.

Mr. WALSH. Now, could not this annual maintenance expense and work be dispensed with if, instead of dredging that channel through the little bay or creek, 4 or 6 feet deep, a channel was cut through to a depth of 15 feet or 20 feet? And the washing in would probably continue to a certain extent, but it would result in sloping down the sides and would not seal up the channel to such an extent.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman has asked a question which is rather one of engineering, but I doubt as a practical proposition whether Congress would be willing to authorize a greater depth than is necessary for existing commerce for the purpose simply of preventing the filling of channels.

The Clerk read as follows:

Charleston Harbor and Channels, S. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$110,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 5, strike out the period at the end of line 21, and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following: "For improvement to provide a channel 40 feet deep and 1,000 wide, extending from the sea to Charleston Navy Yard, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That this work shall not be undertaken until the proposed new dry dock at this navy yard, carrying a depth of 40 feet of water over the blocks, has been authorized; in all, \$1,610,000."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I might make this preliminary statement: When the Naval appropriation bill was recently reported to the House it contained a provision authorizing the construction of a very large dry dock at the navy yard at Charleston, carrying a depth of 40 feet over the blocks. The Naval appropriation bill authorized a further improvement of Charleston Harbor to a depth of 40 feet. Of course, if a dry dock is constructed of the dimensions I have specified, the further deepening of the harbor is absolutely essential for the utilization of the dry dock. That matter came to the attention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and we brought it to the attention of the Secretary of War, accompanied with this statement of the committee, that the War Department had jurisdiction over the improvement of all harbors and channels for the purpose of navigation, whether that navigation was by vessels of commerce or by vessels of war, and that the Navy Department did not have jurisdiction; further, that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had jurisdiction of such improvements and the Committee on Naval Affairs did not.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The naval bill, as I understand the gentleman, provides an appropriation to deepen the harbor surrounding the dry dock? Is that right?

Mr. SMALL. That is a different piece of work from deepening the channel.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that. I am leading up to what I want to say. Provision has already been made in the naval bill for deepening the harbor at the dry dock and surrounding the dry dock. Is that right?

Mr. SMALL. That is in the naval bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, if the expenditure is made as provided in the naval bill, the harbor will have a depth of 40 feet. Is that right?

Mr. SMALL. No. Has the gentleman been to Charleston?

Mr. MADDEN. The harbor itself—

Mr. SMALL. The navy yard is on the Cooper River, and, in fact, most of the harbor of Charleston is on the Cooper River. I can not tell the gentleman at this moment the distance from the navy yard to the sea.

Mr. PADGETT. It is about 6 miles.

Mr. SMALL. Now, this proposition is to give a depth of 40 feet from the navy yard to the sea.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I know. The point I wanted to have the gentleman tell me is this: If the expenditure is made as recommended by the Committee on Naval Affairs—

Mr. SMALL. For the dry dock?

Mr. MADDEN. For the dry dock and the surrounding water, there will be a depth of 40 feet there, presumably for the purpose of building ships with 40-foot draft or repairing ships that have 40-foot draft. Now, the proposition of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is to supplement what the Naval Committee proposes to do by deepening the entrance to the dry dock from the sea, so that facilities will be afforded for the passage of ships from the sea to the dry dock and from the dry dock out to sea?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. MADDEN. So that there would not be any use in expending the money recommended by the Naval Committee unless the House also authorized this expenditure to supplement it. Is that correct?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is correct in that. Now, may I send up to the desk and have read a communication from the Secretary of War recommending this amendment to the bill as a war measure?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 4, 1918.

HON. JOHN H. SMALL,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of April 1, 1918, and prior correspondence concerning the proposed 40-foot channel at Charleston, S. C., for which an item is included in the pending naval appropriation bill, I have the honor to state that I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Navy on this subject, calling attention to the fact that the proposed construction of a dry dock at the navy yard, Charleston, S. C., carrying a depth of water of 40 feet over the blocks, will require for its use the construction of a channel having a depth of 40 feet at mean low water and a width of 1,000 feet extending from deep water beyond the jetties to a point on the Cooper River opposite the

present naval dry dock at the navy yard, and requesting that inasmuch as this proposed dredging is a matter coming under the jurisdiction of the War Department, an item for this work be recommended by this department for inclusion in the pending river and harbor bill.

The preliminary estimate made by the Navy Department for such a 40-foot channel, based upon recent costs of dredging, is \$5,000,000. The item carried in the pending naval appropriation bill provides \$1,000,000 for beginning this work. The Secretary of the Navy states, however, that the dry dock will require approximately 30 months for its construction, or, in other words, it should be completed by January 1, 1921, and suggests that the dredging operations be conducted so that the desired channel shall be completed not later than the estimated date for completion of the dock. The time available has not been sufficient to permit any revision of the above estimate of cost for this work, but this is not essential at this time as an initial appropriation will cover the prosecution of the work for the first year, and the necessary surveys can then be made with a view to submitting a revised estimate of cost at the next session of Congress. It is believed that an appropriation of \$1,500,000 should be made now for this purpose contingent upon the authorization of the proposed dry dock.

In compliance with the request of the Secretary of the Navy, it is, therefore, recommended as a war measure that the item for Charleston Harbor and Channels, S. C., on page 5 of the pending river and harbor bill be amended to read as follows:

"Charleston Harbor and Channels, S. C.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$110,000; for improvement to provide a channel 40 feet deep at mean low water and 1,000 feet wide, extending from the sea to the Charleston Navy Yard, \$1,500,000: *Provided*, That this work shall not be undertaken until the proposed new dry dock at this navy yard, carrying a depth of 40 feet of water over the blocks, has been authorized; in all, \$1,610,000."

Very respectfully,

BENEDICT CROWELL,
Acting Secretary of War.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Let me just make this statement, and then I will yield. This authorization by the proviso does not become effective unless Congress shall hereafter authorize the dry dock. It is obvious that if the dry dock is authorized, the channel ought to be provided, and this is the committee, and this is the place in which to authorize the deepening of the channel to correspond with the dry dock if it shall be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Just half a minute. We have already provided 40 feet to the New York Navy Yard. We have provided 40 feet to the Norfolk Navy Yard. We are providing 35 feet to the League Island Navy Yard at Philadelphia, and now we are simply authorizing this 40-foot channel to the proposed dry dock at Charleston if it shall be authorized.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman coincide with the statement in this letter that this should be acted upon favorably as a war measure, and does he refer to the present war?

Mr. SMALL. It is a war measure in that it refers to war activities of the Government, to wit, the Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, has the chairman of the committee finished with his argument?

Mr. SMALL. Yes. The gentleman wishes recognition in his own right?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes. I desire to oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment now before the House has a peculiarly strategic position. It is the initial expenditure for a \$5,000,000 channel to the Charleston Navy Yard. During my short term in Congress the Charleston yard has repeatedly endeavored to get recognition as a deep-draft vessel location from Congress and from the Committee on Naval Affairs without success. Attempts have repeatedly been made to make a big battleship yard out of the Charleston yard. By "a big battleship yard" I mean a big ship-construction yard, which it is not; and when the chairman of the committee having this bill in charge says we have provided a 40-foot channel to the New York yard, and we have provided a 35-foot channel to the Philadelphia yard, and we have provided a 40-foot channel to the Norfolk yard, he is referring to big construction yards, yards capable of dismantling a battleship. The Charleston yard can not do that if it had a million feet of water.

This movement is just in line with one that was made a couple of years ago to extend and enlarge certain berthing piers down there, which were originally intended for destroyers, with a view to making them big enough and strong enough to berth a battleship.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Naval Committee, through the Navy, to build up the Charleston yard to the extent that it can build these large battleships, like the Brooklyn and Philadelphia yards?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. It is in line with my own thought, and I was about to tell the House that no hearings have been held by the Committee

on Naval Affairs on this tremendous \$9,000,000 appropriation, \$4,000,000 for the dock and \$5,000,000 for this channel. No hearings were had before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. If a construction yard is really desired, I do not know it officially.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. As I understand it, the chairman stated that this would not be effective unless the building of a dock was carried into effect.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is true. That is why I referred to the particular strategic character of this particular amendment. It concerns two committees, and they play one against the other. They say when the Committee on Naval Affairs has recommended an appropriation of \$4,000,000 for the dry dock surely we will not build a dock where there is no water. So this committee will run water up to the dock.

Mr. SEARS. As I understand it, in the naval bill this item would be subject to a point of order. In that case the argument could not be used that this House had passed it because we had provided that it would not be put into effect until that plan had been adopted.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is correct; and the dock itself is as subject to a point of order as the dredging project now before the House.

Mr. SEARS. If the point of order is raised, this would not be effective. I suppose the gentleman is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Suppose that committee should adopt the dry-dock plan and then you could not get the channel. You would be in an awkward position.

Mr. BRITTEN. My dear, sir, both these propositions are carried in the naval bill to-day. A rule is sought making everything in the naval bill not subject to a point of order. That will cover the deepening of the channel as well as the building of the dock.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How many battleships are in the Charleston Navy Yard?

Mr. BRITTEN. None are there, and none will ever go there, unless this House provides water over which they can go. We have a three and one-half million dollar dock building in Philadelphia that will dock anything that will go through the Panama Canal, and we have an enormous dock being built at Norfolk that will carry anything that can enter the Panama Canal, and the State of Massachusetts is building a 1,200-foot dock at Boston that will carry anything that can enter the Panama Canal. These docks are in process of completion to-day on the Atlantic coast. And yet some gentlemen will have the nerve to get on the floor of the House and say that this dock, at an initial expenditure of \$9,000,000, taking three years to construct, is a war measure, and should be appropriated for now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I have five minutes more time, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is not a war measure. If it were a war measure there would be no question about it from my viewpoint. I will be glad to join in authorizing the expenditure of hundreds of billions of dollars if necessary to conduct this war, but when gentlemen get on this floor and propose to build a dock where there is no water, and then to spend \$5,000,000 to get water up to it, it is thoroughly absurd. It is just another movement to make a big battleship yard out of the Charleston yard, a movement which has been attempted time and again, and has always failed in this House on a record vote. Now, supposing we get this dry dock, and supposing we get a thousand-foot channel 40 feet deep to the dock, and then we send a battleship up there to have one of its turrets removed or one of its big guns removed, is there anything in the Charleston yard to-day that can move it? They have not the mechanical equipment there, they have not the buildings to handle big repairs. Then will come another \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000 for necessary mechanical and yard improvements. This \$9,000,000 is just the initial expenditure of what may be \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that yesterday the Committee of the Whole, against the protest of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, put into this bill the proposition to deepen Hell Gate to 40 feet as

a war measure, when it will take four or five years to complete it.

Mr. BRITTEN. And I will say to the gentleman that the deepening of Hell Gate is one of the most important war propositions possible. Last year our committee went through Hell Gate on the *Mayflower*, and we were swept back three times, and if we had not had a very skillful and daring commander in young Commander Berry, who is now commanding the destroyer *Manly* on the other side, we would have been dashed against the rocks in Hell Gate. That is a very dangerous place and the obstructions there should be removed. But this proposition which we are now considering is no war measure. It is a farce. This \$9,000,000 is merely a starter to an enormous expenditure to come in the future. If a battleship were to dock there to-day, they could not remove one of the big guns. They have no traveling cranes or heavy cranes capable of lifting a turret or the guns of a great battleship; they have not the mechanical equipment for the repair of great pieces of armor and armament on a battleship. The yard is absolutely useless to-day, even if they had the water, for the purpose of making extensive repairs on a great battleship.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Suppose \$5,000,000 were spent in constructing the channel; would the channel stay 40 feet deep?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am glad to have the gentleman from Ohio refresh my memory about something that I would probably have forgotten. About three or four years ago the electric suction dredge that is always employed around Charleston got out of order and it was laid up for repairs for about six months. Will you gentlemen be surprised when I tell you that in front of the dock that is now there they did not have 9 feet of water at the end of that time, because of the silt that had settled in the meantime? Now, supposing we agreed—

Mr. WHALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WHALEY. The gentleman just made the statement that the suction dredge got out of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WHALEY. As a matter of fact, was it not the bulkhead of the dock that got out of order and had to be taken to Norfolk to be repaired, and they did not dredge in front of the dock during the absence of that bulkhead for six months? Those are the facts in the case.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will give the gentleman the facts. The bulkhead does not do any dredging.

Mr. WHALEY. Of course not; but the dredge—

Mr. BRITTEN. The dredge itself was out of order, and the silt settled and they did not have 9 feet of water in front of the dock.

Mr. WHALEY. The bulkhead of the dock was taken away for repairs because it was leaking, and there was no use to dredge in front of the dock, when they could not use the dock because there was no bulkhead there. The dock was out of use for six months while the bulkhead was being repaired, and no dredging was done in front of the dock during that time. But the dredge has never been out of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not the bulkhead the front of the dock?

Mr. WHALEY. Why, of course it is, and you remove the bulkhead in order to get into the dock, and you close the bulkhead when you want to keep the water out of the dock.

Mr. BRITTEN. Exactly so. When the bulkhead was taken away the dock was filled with water, was it not?

Mr. WHALEY. I am claiming that the dredge was never out of order.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am telling you that in front of the bulkhead they did not have 9 feet of water.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is true that the river will silt up unless it is constantly dredged. If you are going to have a thousand-foot channel with a depth of 40 feet of water, you have got to have at least one dredge there all the time working 24 hours a day. I question whether one dredge can do it. I am not engineer enough to determine that. But this is just the initial expenditure of something that may be enormous, and the House ought to consider it very carefully. This project has been brought forward time and time again, and has always been defeated on the floor of the House. It is not a war measure, because the report of the Secretary of War says it will take 30 months, I believe, to do the dredging. It will take 30 months

or three years to build the dock. After we have the dock built, it can not accommodate a battleship so far as repairs are concerned, because they have not sufficient mechanical equipment in the yard.

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asked a question a while ago concerning the length of this channel. The channel provided in the amendment is from the sea to the navy yard, up the Cooper River. It is not a commercial proposition in any sense of the word. It is a 1,000-foot channel from the sea to the navy yard, and the depth provided is 40 feet. It is pork of the purest kind. This is a time when Congress is willing to give millions of dollars for any war expenditure, without even inquiring into its value, but it should not waste a penny on pork. We are ready to appropriate everything that is asked. Every Member in the House and Senate is ready to appropriate for any reasonable war measure. Be fair with yourself, gentlemen, and understand that this is pork, pure and simple. Get your feet into this pork barrel. Now is the time to develop the Charleston yard and make it a great battleship yard. Let us get the dock and real water first, and then we will come in after millions for mechanical equipment; because naturally we must have the equipment after we have the dock and the water. Oh, the shame, at a time like this, when we are taxing every ounce of our energy at home, to foist upon a confiding public a quantity of pork such as would never be countenanced in peace time, when the war scare and fake patriotism could not be used to camouflage our votes.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman made the statement a moment ago that the Cooper River was greatly subject to siltage. Is that true?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman let me read from the Helm report?

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from South Carolina can do that in his own time.

Mr. LEVER. But the gentleman has made a misstatement.

Mr. BRITTEN. I shall not object to the gentleman reading from the Helm report.

Mr. LEVER. This is from the Helm report of January 15, 1918:

In regard to the dredging for maintenance of approaches to the water front at this yard there seems to be an erroneous impression that much silt is deposited at all points. Matter is only appreciably deposited at still points away from the strength of the current, and such matter is a slimy mud, easily removed by a suction dredge.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is very true; the report is entirely correct. There is a lot of silt there and it is easily removed. The report says so; but I have never heard anything about the character of the soil at a depth of 40 feet. They may find rock.

Mr. LEVER. Let me read something further from the report on that point:

A small electric suction dredge, costing about \$12,000 for running and upkeep per year, can easily keep this portion of the yard free and do other dredging work as required.

Mr. BRITTEN. What portion of the yard is that?

Mr. LEVER. In front of the dock.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; in front of the dock, 100 feet wide.

Mr. LEVER. And the balance of the channel.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, the gentleman does not mean the balance of the channel, does he?

Mr. LEVER. In front of the dock.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; a little \$12,000 barge will take the silt away from a 100-foot-wide place, but what about the balance of the channel, 7 miles long? I say it will cost more than \$150,000 to dredge the channel if we are to maintain a 40-foot depth 1,000 feet wide.

Mr. WHALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. WHALEY. Did the gentleman ever read the Engineer's report on the subject?

Mr. BRITTEN. Which report? They have made dozens.

Mr. WHALEY. I mean the recent report.

Mr. BRITTEN. Which one?

Mr. WHALEY. The Helm report. I have it here; and it says that for the entire business, from the navy yard to the sea, 14 miles, \$160,000 will keep it open, one-half of what it costs at Philadelphia or New York.

Mr. BRITTEN. Well, I guessed \$150,000.

Mr. WHALEY. The gentleman said in front of the dock.

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I said to keep the desired channel open.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be well to get a clear, concise, and consecutive statement of the situation.

It is true that we are building at Philadelphia a 1,000-foot dock, with 40 feet over the blocks. We are building one at Norfolk, and the State of Massachusetts is building one at Boston in the State of Massachusetts. South of Norfolk, for something like 2,500 or 3,000 miles of coast line, we have no naval accommodations adequate and sufficient. We have a plant at Charleston susceptible of splendid development. They have there 30 feet of water, and will have a channel out to the open sea of 30 feet by September.

They speak about having no water; 30 feet is as much water as we had at many places several years ago. It would cost less to do the dredging at Charleston than it will to maintain the dredging at New York or Philadelphia, so that these matters offset themselves.

Now, what is the situation? We have 2,500 miles of seacoast below Norfolk without a large dock. We have authorized six battle cruisers. They are 850 feet in length and they draw at mean low draft 31 feet. If they are disabled, they might draw as much as 45 feet. At Charleston, if we have a 40-foot channel, there is 5 feet of tide, and that would give 45 feet in a high tide that could be available for the use of the dock.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. These battle cruisers of which the gentleman speaks, are they under process of construction?

Mr. PADGETT. Not just now.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. When is it expected that they will be completed?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know; but probably three or four years.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Was not the original estimate that it would take four years to construct them?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And they have not yet begun them?

Mr. PADGETT. Not yet; but we have a number of battleships in addition to the battle cruisers. We authorized battleships of more than 40,000 tons displacement carrying twelve 16-inch guns. We are building others of 32,000 tons displacement, with 14-inch guns. We need docks for taking the battleships that are under construction and some of which are in existence. We have at Charleston a dock that is capable of taking ships of the size and class of the *Utah*, and that is about 22,000 tons displacement, but we have accommodations for nothing larger than that. We have numbers of ships above 22,000 tons displacement. Now, all the strategists say that if we ever have a naval engagement on our side of the water, all the indications point to the fact that it will be in the south or in the Caribbean. We have nothing south of Hatteras. Hatteras is known as the graveyard of the Atlantic so far as the danger of sinking ships is concerned.

The Secretary of the Navy earnestly urged and recommended the construction of a large dock at Charleston. I took the position with the committee, and I want to be entirely frank here, that we ought to have a dock of this character south of Hatteras, and all of the authorities agree that on the coast main line of the United States Charleston is not only the best place but it is about the only place that is available. That is about 700 miles south of Norfolk. Seven hundred miles might be very important in saving a disabled ship. When we are building battleships that are costing \$28,000,000 apiece, as we are, we can not in good business judgment jeopardize them by failing to provide safety for them in the neighborhood that all of the military strategists point out is the field of battle. Those battleships draw at mean load about 30 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. These battleships, as well as the battle cruisers, draw at mean draft more than 30 feet. It is true that you have a tide of about 5 feet rise where they could go into the yard, but that tide lasts only for a few hours; and if your ship comes in on a 35-foot high tide, which on low tide is down to 30 feet, and the ship draws 31 feet, necessarily the ship then at mean draft would go down a foot into the mud and rest upon the bottom, which would be very hazardous for these splendid ships. No one could tolerate that. So that I said in the committee, and I say here, that we need and should have a dock south of Hatteras, and there should be one at Charleston; but unless we can get the water to make that dock usable, I would not stand for the dock. I would not advocate

or ask the construction of a dock 40 feet over the block, or 42 or 43 feet over the sill, to accommodate ships that can pass through the Panama Canal, because there will be commercial uses as well as naval uses also, if we did not have the water. We need the dock, and we should have the water for it. If we can get the water as is provided here, I stand for the dock; but if the House refuses the water, it would be silly to provide a dock with 40 feet over the blocks or 42 feet over the sills. Therefore the Naval Committee placed in the bill the coupled proposition of a dock and the water.

The question of committee jurisdiction arose. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has jurisdiction over the question of the dredging of the channels in the harbors and in the river outside of the basin at the navy yards, but it was so important that we should have the water if we were to have the dock that I was unwilling to report a proposition for a dock unless we had the assurance that we would get the water. Therefore we coupled the two in the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me finish this sentence and I shall. The committee reported out the proposition for the dock and for a 40-foot channel a thousand feet wide. As I stated, these cruisers are 850 feet long, and if we are going to have a channel, we ought to have one with a margin for turning around. The question of committee jurisdiction arose, and in speaking with Mr. SMALL I said to him that the Naval Committee did not wish to usurp or to infringe upon the rights of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and if they would report this measure and the House adopted it, it would be stricken out of the naval bill and we would ask only for the dock. He has done that. The Secretary of War has recommended it; the Secretary of the Navy has urged it. We should have the dock. We need it. It is a necessity. We ought not to spend \$4,000,000 for it, however, unless we can get the water to make it usable. That is the plain business proposition, and this is the proposition for the water. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee and I will agree that we have been at this business a good while. I know what is going to be done, and therefore there is no use of opposing it. I only want to say to my chairman that the opposition I have to this I purpose using upon the stump for all time to come, but not here, because the die is cast and this is to be built; but the gentleman and I will agree that this is not a war proposition.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not a war proposition in the sense that it can be constructed within the time within which I hope the war will end. I hope the war will end before three years. I think it will take three years to build the dock and do the dredging. However, independent of the war, as a sensible naval proposition we should have the dock, whether we are in the war or not. The idea of having from 2,500 to 3,000 miles of coast line without a dock, without an opportunity to bring in and repair or care for our ships when the ships, as I said, many of them cost us \$28,000,000, shows no business judgment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is always reasonable and speaks out plainly, and therefore I want to ask him a question or two. This is not the best place, however, to be selected for a large appropriation of money for naval purposes, is it?

Mr. PADGETT. To be entirely frank with the gentleman, I think that we need and should have two navy yards and large docks south of Hatteras, one on the coast line and one in the West Indies. I think the finest place in the world is in Samana Bay on the north of the east end of the island of Haiti. I have never seen or known of such a place as nature built there for a naval station; but we do not own it at present. I cherish the hope that we will in the future; but that would be 1,500 to 2,000 miles from Charleston.

Mr. BUTLER. Again I want to say that I am not going to oppose this, but I want to get some facts for the Record so that we will have them. What is the estimate of the cost of this great dock?

Mr. PADGETT. Four million dollars.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the chairman agree with me that that will not build it?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know that. I think it will. The one at Norfolk is being built within the appropriation of three and a half million dollars, and the one at Philadelphia is being built within that limit of cost. This is adding \$500,000 additional.

Mr. BUTLER. These contracts were made some time ago, were they not?

Mr. PADGETT. My recollection is about 18 months ago.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, what is the estimated cost of the construction of this channel?

Mr. PADGETT. The dredging they are doing there now and have been doing under the appropriations heretofore made was 13 cents per cubic yard—

Mr. BUTLER. Amounting to about \$5,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. It is estimated at a cost of 20 cents a yard. The present contract cost is 13 cents, and therefore 26,000,000 cubic yards in round numbers would amount to about \$5,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, can I ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs this question? How much did Admiral Parks recommend each year to keep this channel clean?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the report—the Helm Board report—varied from somewhere between \$160,000 and \$180,000 out to deep water beyond the jetties.

Mr. BUTLER. We agree on this, and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it, he reported that it would take \$185,000 a year to keep the channels clean when made.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall, but that is in substance the Helm Board report.

Mr. BUTLER. It has been our observation always that they increase these estimates by 15 to 25 per cent.

Mr. PADGETT. As to the outer channel I do not know. The dredging at Charleston has been practically in front of the present large dock. As the gentleman is aware, the present dock is—

Mr. BUTLER. I never was there.

Mr. PADGETT. (continuing). Set inland and the current of the stream runs out in front of the dock, and there is an eddy in front of the dock, and the deposit of the silt is in that eddy in front. This dock is proposed to be put out on the line of the current so as to avoid that deposit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask that I may have five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I have taken up a good deal of the gentleman's time with interruptions, and I ask that he may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, then, we are agreed it is not going to be a war measure, because we know this improvement can not be made in three years. Now, will the chairman agree—

Mr. PADGETT. I think it will take at least three years.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the chairman agree with me as to the wisdom of postponing this permanent construction there at this time because of the scarcity of labor in the country?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, of course, the labor question is an important question, but the consideration of having a dock south of Hatteras on our south coast is so great I do not want to postpone the matter.

Mr. BUTLER. I know what is going to happen—I do not ask the chairman for any explanation whatever, but I know what is going to happen. I have been here long enough to know. Now, will the gentleman yield for another question? Does the gentleman agree with the President's 14 conditions which he submitted to the world, that we should at this time make an appropriation that will result finally in an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for a great improvement after this war is over? Will the gentleman explain that to the committee?

Mr. PADGETT. I will be very frank with the gentleman; I do not think the millennium is going to come at the conclusion of this war.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think when this country has built up a magnificent Navy and has it well equipped and efficient that we are going to scrap it.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand we may not. I think the chairman and I will have little to do with it, but the President will have much to do with it. Will the gentleman advise us to look so far in the future as to begin at this time a dock which will result in appropriations of millions of dollars? Is that a good thing to do?

Mr. PADGETT. I think we ought to build this dock. I think it is necessary to have it, as I stated, independent of the war; that, whatever we may have after the war, we ought to have this dock south of Cape Hatteras.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Was the gentleman—I think he was—a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs when the first improvement was made at the Charleston Harbor for the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I was not, sir. That was several years before I came to Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Then the gentleman can not answer the question I was about to ask.

Mr. PADGETT. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is intended by the Committee on Naval Affairs or the Navy Department to build a great navy yard at this point?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. I think they ought to have a good yard there.

Mr. FOSTER. Where they will build battleships?

Mr. PADGETT. Not a construction yard.

Mr. FOSTER. But a repair yard?

Mr. PADGETT. A repair yard; a docking yard.

Mr. FOSTER. This dry dock will take three or four years to finish, I understand?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary, in a letter to me, which I have here, stated that he thought it could be constructed in 30 months. I think it will take three years.

Mr. FOSTER. Unless the war extends over a period of several years this would not be of any benefit during the present war, would it?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. If we are to take three years in building, of course it would not be usable under that time; but I stated a while ago that, independent of the fact that we are at war, that we should have a dock south of Hatteras, and the gentleman knows the hazardous risk of going around Hatteras. It is known in ocean parlance as the "graveyard of the Atlantic coast," and to attempt to bring our ships of great cost and value around there and over a distance of 2,500 or 3,000 miles without a dock—there is no good business proposition in that.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman know what the estimated cost for this construction would be?

Mr. PADGETT. The dredging?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean to put this in proper shape for the repair of naval vessels, including the dry dock and dredging, and all.

Mr. PADGETT. The dry dock is estimated to cost \$4,000,000. That is \$500,000 above similar docks at Norfolk and Philadelphia. The dredging is estimated at 20 cents a cubic yard instead of 13 cents, at the present contract, and it is estimated there are 26,000,000 cubic yards, which would cost \$5,000,000. That would be \$9,000,000 estimated cost. Now, then, they would have to have a large crane there to lift the big guns off and on. I should say that outside of that, \$2,500,000 or \$3,000,000 would fit it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PADGETT. I ask for one additional minute.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the committee have five additional minutes if he desires to use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may have five additional minutes if he desires to use that much time. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. I know he has been on the Committee on Naval Affairs for many years and is well informed on naval affairs, and I would like to ask if in his judgment we ought to begin now, with the high cost of everything and with the scarcity of labor, this construction, and if it is absolutely necessary for the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. It is a matter of so much importance that I do not like to postpone it. Independent of the war, we need something south. I think we ought to have one in the West Indies as well as one on the coast line south of Hatteras.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the gentleman's judgment that this is the best place for it?

Mr. PADGETT. It is the best place on the mainland. All the authorities agree upon that. But in the West Indies, in my judgment—

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman that the reason I have asked these questions is because I have been here several years, and I know that Congress has refused to do much with this Charleston Navy Yard.

Mr. PADGETT. There has been a great deal done there. Now, that reminds me that only recently the Secretary of War has set apart \$16,000,000 under Gen. Goethals for building, just above the navy yard, and would use this channel—\$16,000,000 for the construction of storage and shipbuilding facilities on account of this war.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that to be permanent, or just during this war?

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I can not say. A great deal of it will be permanent after the war is over. Of course, some would go away.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they erecting permanent buildings there now?

Mr. PADGETT. I have no information on that; I can not say. Does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY] know the nature of the buildings?

Mr. WHALEY. They are to be of permanent construction. The testimony before the Appropriations Committee was that these storage houses there were to be permanent, and not to be temporary structures.

Mr. PADGETT. I was not informed on that particular phase of it.

Mr. WHALEY. They are just above the navy yard—a half mile. They are reached by the same river. Ships would have to go by the navy yard to get there.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman before he takes his seat. Having in mind what the gentleman has so frankly stated to the House, if he knows, I would like to have him inform the House what the Acting Secretary of War had in mind when in the letter to the gentleman he used this language:

It is therefore recommended—

Mr. PADGETT. That letter is to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL]. It is not to me.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Very well, to Mr. SMALL, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors:

It is therefore recommended as a war measure that the item for Charleston Harbor and Channel * * * be inserted in the pending bill.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of War regards it as a war measure, and the Secretary of the Navy also so regards it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And in the same letter they state that it will not be completed in less than three years.

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy said two and one-half years. I am frank to say that I think it would take three years to construct them. But whether it takes two years, or two years and a half, or three years; whether we have war or do not have war, it would be for the safety of this country. We have had enough experience, I think, in overlooking some things. I think we ought, when we see this before us, to consider it a duty and an obligation and prepare for it, independent of the continuance of the present war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am inclined to support this proposition, and I want to ask the gentleman this: Whereas several ports along the Atlantic coast, including Philadelphia and Baltimore, have 35-foot channels, and Boston has that and more, would it be unreasonable to start Charleston on a 35-foot basis?

Mr. PADGETT. I always want to be frank with the House. A 40-foot channel is needed. If you are going to have a 40-foot basin and 40 feet over the blocks in the docks, and if your ships that are liable to go in draw 45 feet if they are disabled, I think, we may just as well face the matter frankly and honestly and proceed with what we know will ultimately be required. It does not take any more money at the present time. The appropriation is only \$1,500,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman's statement about having a dry dock south of Norfolk, or south of Hatteras. I think the time has come when we should establish such a dock along the south Atlantic coast. But this proposition comes before the House in an unusual way. It is provided that we shall have a dry dock if we get the water.

Mr. PADGETT. No. The Naval Committee reported the two proposals coupled together, an appropriation for both. But this other is conditioned upon the dock. If you do not get the dock, there is no use in making this appropriation; if you do not get this, there is no use in giving the other. But we need both. I hope the House will approve this, and then when we reach the other, in the naval bill, give us the dry dock.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, is it possible to get unanimous consent to fix a time for closing debate on this paragraph and the amendment?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I want to be heard a few minutes.

Mr. FREAR. I desire to have about seven minutes. I want to read from the reports. This talk is not related to the official reports.

Mr. SMALL. Could we agree by unanimous consent to close the debate in 45 minutes?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Reserving the right to object, the time so far consumed has been consumed almost entirely in

favor of the proposition, except that occupied by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. If the time is evenly divided there is no way of knowing how these nine men are to talk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. SMALL. I ask unanimous consent, then, Mr. Chairman, that we close debate in one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in one hour.

Mr. FREAR. Reserving the right to object, will the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have the right to discuss it in this time?

Mr. SMALL. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, will have some time.

Mr. FREAR. I ask that because of the fact that we have not yet taken part in this debate.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that this item of dredging will go through. I am a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am one of those who have opposed advancement or increase for the Charleston Navy Yard, believing that it was not the place for a large dry dock and extensive operations. Last summer I visited Charleston, and was very much impressed with the activities of that yard; but, like the chairman of the committee, I was still opposed to a large dock there when we had not a sufficient depth of water.

I realize the fact that south of Hatteras there are no dry docks, and there should be some. As the chairman has stated, we should have one in the Caribbean Sea. We have not enough dry docks in the United States to-day, even north of Hatteras.

Now, the only place on the main seacoast for this proposed dock is at the Charleston Navy Yard. We have no activities anywhere else.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What are those activities, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. BROWNING. They are engaged there in almost all naval activities, including the building of vessels.

Mr. BUTLER. They are?

Mr. BROWNING. They were building chasers while I was there, though this is not a building yard. It is, as the chairman has said, a repair yard. They have a dock there to-day that will dock any ship of the *Utah* class, and all that is needed is depth of water.

Now, the Secretary of the Navy has recommended very strongly that this new dock be built. I made the motion in the committee that it be built, provided we can get 40 feet of water. There is, of course, no necessity for a dock unless we can have the water, and if we do get the water the dock should be built right there.

Now, I feel that it is essential that we should build this dock at Charleston, because there is not one nearer than Norfolk, about 700 miles away; and in that long coast line there should be a dock to repair vessels of the Navy.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman agree with me that the mechanical equipment at Charleston is entirely inadequate for extensive repairs on battleships now?

Mr. BROWNING. Probably it is; but with an expenditure for a crane to remove the big guns I think good work can be done at Charleston.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is there any mechanical equipment at Charleston with a crane that would move a big gun to repair or reline that big gun?

Mr. BROWNING. There is not; and I do not know of any other yard where there is.

Mr. FOSTER. That yard has not been equipped for this work?

Mr. BROWNING. It has not been. I hope it will be. It should be.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman advocates this item, and he is well informed. Has the gentleman in mind what this means—how much of an appropriation it will be necessary to make in Charleston to repair and construct ships?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not know what it will cost, but in my opinion an expenditure of \$2,500,000 or \$3,000,000 will equip that navy yard to repair ships.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman basing his report on an estimate of a Navy official?

Mr. BROWNING. We have no estimate from a naval official on that matter.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is an estimate of his own, then?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes; it is an estimate of my own. If the gentleman has a better estimate, I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have three minutes in which to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Reserving the right to object, the members of the committee have not had a chance to speak. We are the ones who are making the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if this were a motion to make a reasonable appropriation reasonably to develop commercial facilities at Charleston Harbor, I would vote for it. If this were a proposition to make more efficient this Government in the prosecution of this war, I, like other Members here, would vote for it.

But this is neither. This is a proposition to appropriate an abnormal sum of money, although it is but the beginning of larger appropriations yet to come, artificially, first, to build a naval station, and, second, a river leading up to it. It is an artificial proposition first and last. We have first got to build a river, and then they say if we build the river they will build a dock and naval works at the end of it. Why would they not? If you will build a river to Peoria, Ill., I have not the slightest doubt that they would be glad to have you construct a navy yard, dry dock, and so forth, there.

A few years ago I had the privilege of visiting Charleston Harbor and looking over this proposition. It did not require the eye of an expert. It required just the eye of an ordinary common-sense individual, who could see and interpret a little bit that which he saw, to know that the placing of the plant there, in the first place, was not because of any naval consideration at all. I asked Navy officials why that plant had been placed there, and they all said they did not know, that they thought I ought to know more than they about it, because they understood the reason for it was in Congress and not outside.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; I can not yield. If I can get some more time I will yield.

Mr. BROWNING. They did not give me any more time.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. At the time I was there I went in on a boat of 10,000 tons, and we were hung up all night long 4 miles from the town waiting for a tide that could take us in. At that time the only use to which the dock which is there now could be put was for torpedo boats; and I did find one or two naval officers who said it was their opinion that this was valuable as a torpedo-boat station, but valueless for any other purpose. Now, you can not convince me that there is any practical common sense in spending an enormous sum of money to build a river, at the end of which you are going to build a naval station; and the fact that there is not a naval station for 2,500 miles of coast does not convince me of the propriety of this. This is but 600 or 700 miles from Norfolk. I have been an enthusiastic supporter of every proposition to develop the Norfolk yard. That should be the great naval base on the Atlantic coast, and any money that is asked for that place should receive the hearty approval of Members of Congress. But this is not that at all. This is but a few miles geographically south, however the coast may curve. When you reach Charleston, S. C., you have still got your 2,000 miles and more of coast where there is no navy yard. If you will take a look at the map you can see at a glance that this navy yard should be located, not at Charleston at all, having in mind that which the chairman of the Naval Committee has just stated and that which is common to the intelligence of most of those who have thought at all on naval subjects, but that the place for the naval station is either on the Gulf coast or in the West Indies, and probably in the West Indies. Why did we buy St. Thomas a year ago, giving \$25,000,000 for it? Why have we been told repeatedly that that is the place for a naval station, in the West Indies? It is true, as the gentleman said, that any naval engagement will probably be in the vicinity of the West Indies somewhere, in a key position relative to the United States and the Panama Canal. What good will it be, then, to have a sinking ship within a thousand miles of Charleston?

It would be just as well to have it within 1,500 miles of Norfolk. The difference does not amount to anything. Build your

naval station, if you must, in the West Indies; and I think you ought. There are two places now where the United States needs a great naval base. One is in the West Indies and the other is at Guam, and every naval official will tell you so. The money you are going to spend on this job will artificially create something that will be of advantage to Charleston, S. C., but it will be of no material advantage to the Nation, and that amount of money would build the naval base at Guam that the United States has been needing so much for these many, many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; my friends, this is one of those propositions that will never, never down. It has been kicking at the gates of this Chamber for years. The inception of the proposition was some years ago, when a gentleman influential in the Government desired an expenditure of public funds there at his home place. We have been scandalized at times because public moneys have been used to build useless Army posts, useless naval stations, and it has been the general consensus of opinion that the most useless expenditure we have ever made, for the most useless purpose, was that at Charleston, S. C. They see that now, so they come back and ask that, in addition to the \$10,000,000 heretofore spent, you spend \$30,000,000 more to build a river and build a naval station, and when they get that, then they say they will have something serviceable to the country. You never can convince me that the Navy is going to live or die dependent upon the expenditure of \$30,000,000 to build a river into the interior and then a dry dock at its end. Pensacola, Mobile, New Orleans, and other places in the South have ample facilities infinitely better than Charleston, where a much smaller expenditure than this would furnish these facilities. It is Charleston, S. C., that wants this; and if the Nation wants it, I have not heard the Nation's voice.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, if this were a war measure, and if it were needed by the Government for the prosecution of this war, I would be the last man in the House to raise my voice against it. I have supported every war measure. But this proposition, as the gentleman who has just preceded me has stated, is known throughout the length and breadth of the country for the scandal that occurred when it was originally proposed. Now, Mr. Chairman, it comes here in a peculiar way. Our committee were hurriedly called together, long after the introduction of this bill, and told in a few minutes that we were to put this measure into the bill. We have never had a hearing. We have not the first understanding, except from what these gentlemen have stated on the floor, of the necessity or even desirability of this project, but we are asked to put \$5,000,000 in the Charleston Harbor without any hearing and without any notice. I ask any member of the committee to refute that statement. I understand there has been no hearing in the Naval Committee. All we have to rely upon is the reports of the engineers, and those have been offered largely for commercial reasons. But let us see what the engineers say concerning the naval station at Charleston. I have here before me the report of the engineers, Document No. 947 of the Sixty-first Congress, second session, and on page 8 the engineer says, as follows:

The largest battleships can now cross the Charleston bar by entering at high water—

Remember, they had only 26 feet of water then—

the channel being 600 feet wide and 26 feet deep at mean low water. The mean rise of tide is 5.2 feet. The entrance channels are straight and easily navigated.

When this was written, with the 26-foot channel, the engineer said that it was sufficient for all naval uses for the largest battleships. Now, you propose to make it 14 feet deeper, to a proposed depth of 40 feet. This is all we have got to enlighten us on the subject except the verbal statement presented to us by various gentlemen, and I do not question the gentlemen, but I know the importance and necessity sometimes at different localities of getting these projects. I say as a war measure it can not be defended, and it can not be defended, according to the statement of the Army engineers which I have read, nor can it be of value or constructed for several years to come. It will be of no use in this war.

I read from Document No. 19, Sixty-third Congress, second session. The report says:

The report referred to in this document recommended an improvement of Cooper River to a depth of 30 feet, at an estimated cost of \$175,000, in the interest of the Navy, there being no commercial need at that time for the improvement. The project has not been adopted.

There has been no objection to the 30-foot project, and the Engineer's report shows that there are no terminals unless they

have been recently constructed. The commerce is comparatively small, and all terminals are privately owned, according to the report.

Now, what we want to know are the facts. We never have had a chance to ascertain what the facts are regarding the new \$5,000,000 project, and yet we are asked to put in a waterway costing \$5,000,000, and possibly \$20,000,000 for aught we know. We have no idea where the limit will be with the dry-dock proposition. For that reason I say it can not be justified. If you start now, you have opened the door for wasteful appropriations that may be made at all times. All you have to do is to say that this or that committee demands jurisdiction, and we will adopt the project whether they have an intelligent understanding of the proposition or not. The Secretary of War recommended every project needed for the prosecution of the war before he left for France and after the bill was reported. A subordinate officer now urges a plan without any hearings, and in the face of the Engineer's report that the present channel will float the largest naval vessels.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. BURNETT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Young, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9901) to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3803) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States in connection with or incidental to the prosecution of the war, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. HITCHCOCK, and Mr. WARREN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments to bills of the following titles:

S. 3863. An act to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases; and

S. 2917. An act to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes."

RIVERS AND HARBORS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, in view of the lengthy discussion of this proposition, I feel it my duty to explain the attitude of the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and my own attitude as to this proposed amendment. This is a naval proposition. It is a war necessity, and not a commercial proposition. Year after year we have turned the further deepening of the channel down as a commercial proposition, but as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee I do not feel that it is incumbent upon me to demand hearings, to have the facts brought before my committee, in order to vote for a project providing adequate water after we are informed that the Naval Committee is going to have constructed a dry dock as a war necessity. That is a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the Naval Committee. When the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War say to me as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that such a thing is a war necessity or a naval necessity or a military necessity, I do not feel that I, as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, should go any further in the investigation of that proposition.

I do not believe that it is within the jurisdiction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to investigate as to whether or not there is need of a dry dock at Charleston, S. C., after the Naval Committee or Navy Department determines the necessity. Whenever the War Department determines, or whenever the Navy Department determines, to erect a dock and asks that a depth of water be provided, we will not run counter to those two great departments in that work by refusing to provide them the water to the dock. And recollect, gentlemen, that the appropriation is conditioned solely on the construction of the \$4,000,000 dry dock. If the Navy Department does not do what it says it is going to do there will not be a single dollar of the appropriation expended. But if the Navy Department does construct the dry dock no member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee—of course the House committee has a right to do as it pleases—no member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee should undertake to in any way obstruct or delay the Naval or Military Departments. We

feel that this is a matter entirely outside of our province. What I want the members of the committee to understand at this time is that if we vote to refuse the proposed depth of channel to the dry dock you are voting against something that the Naval Committee proposes, and does not affect the Rivers and Harbors Committee at all. It is immaterial to us except we feel that it is our patriotic duty when the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War says a thing is necessary as a war measure, that they are going to construct a dry dock to accommodate war vessels at Charleston, S. C., it is our duty as patriotic members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee to recommend the appropriation necessary to make the dock useful.

That is the way I feel about the matter. Now, as far as the length of time is concerned, the House went on record yesterday in a matter that it will take five years to complete, the deepening of the channel at Hell Gate as a war measure, and if this can be completed in three years I do not see why the time should be used as an argument against the proposition.

It was pointed out by the chairman of the Naval Committee, and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING], who is on the Naval Committee, that this is certainly a strategic proposition; that if there is ever any great naval battle in the South Atlantic, it will be in this region, and there ought to be a large dry dock constructed at Charleston, S. C., to take care of injured or damaged vessels. But recollect that we do not claim that it is a commercial necessity. We have only based our recommendation on the proposition that the Naval Department is going to construct a dry dock.

Mr. WHALEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating this amendment from local considerations alone. So far as the amendment is concerned, it comes from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The chairman has explained to you the reason why the committee has offered this amendment to the bill. It was at the solicitation of the Secretary of War, who was requested by the Secretary of the Navy, as a naval necessity. If any amendment has ever come before this House free from local influence, it is this amendment. If any amendment has ever come before this House saturated with war necessities, it is this amendment. I do not care to speak to this amendment from the war requirement standpoint, but I do want to eradicate from your minds misapprehensions and misstatements which may have found lodgment there in respect to the Charleston Navy Yard. This House has been harangued each year with misstatement and misinformation in reference to the navy yard at Charleston, and I propose for five minutes to tell you the history of that yard.

In 1901, under an act of Congress, a commission was appointed by Secretary John D. Long, a Republican Secretary of the Navy in President McKinley's Cabinet, to seek the most available site on the south Atlantic coast for a navy yard, and that commission selected Charleston. The commission was headed by Admiral Rogers. The commission selected Charleston because it was strategically the place on the south Atlantic coast to put a navy yard. Year after year attacks have been made upon that yard on the ground that it is a political yard. The Members of this House have never seemed to realize the fact that it was put there by a naval commission composed of naval officers; that it was placed there because it was the most available and desirable place to have a yard.

Two years ago, in order to wipe out any misunderstandings, to take away any feeling that this yard was a political yard, this House, under an act of Congress, appointed another commission, and that commission went down on the south Atlantic and Gulf coasts and examined every harbor, and it made its report to this Congress. This was the Helm Commission, a commission being composed of naval officers. This commission reported as follows:

After carefully weighing all the advantages and disadvantages, including costs, of the various sites between Hatteras and Key West, Fla., the commission is of the opinion that on this coast line Charleston Harbor most nearly meets the physical requirements of the Navy Department for a first-class navy yard.

The Members of the House ought to bear in mind that we have 2,500 miles of Atlantic seaboard, 1,200 miles from the Canadian line to Cape Hatteras. That composes the north Atlantic coast. In those 1,200 miles there are five big navy yards, there are five harbors with 40 feet of water—Portsmouth, N. H., Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Norfolk. There is a navy yard with deep water for almost every 250 miles. After you pass Cape Hatteras there are 1,000 miles of seacoast to the end of Florida, Jupiter Inlet. In that whole coast of 1,000 miles there is only one navy yard, and that is the Charleston yard. Charleston is 415 miles from Norfolk and 488 miles from Key West, Fla., almost exactly in the middle of all that stretch of coast. There is not a single naval officer who has ever appeared before any of the committees of the

House, or who has ever talked to me, who has not said that the next fight we will have on the ocean by any country attacking this country will be in the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHALEY. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. I would be very glad indeed if the gentleman could take the time to explain why he thinks the next naval engagement will be in the Caribbean Sea? I ask the question for this reason: Yesterday when we were discussing the proposition of deepening New York Harbor, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard made the statement that all naval officers agree that if there ever was a great naval battle fought in this country it would be at New York, in Long Island Sound. The gentleman and the chairman of the Naval Committee are somewhat at variance. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs says all naval authorities agree that it will occur in the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. WHALEY. I am quoting to you the naval officers' opinion. I will give you an admiral's opinion.

Mr. BOOHER. I want to know why it is that they have their fighting points so far apart?

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not probable that the next great naval battle will be fought where the appropriation is desired?

Mr. WHALEY. Perhaps it will be fought out in Illinois, on the Lakes, I do not know. They have a training station out there, but they always send the boys to the ocean to do the fighting.

Mr. BRITTEN. And that is where the best boys come from, too.

Mr. WHALEY. I admit that some of them do, but not all.

As I was saying just now, on the North Atlantic coast you have five deep-water ports and you have five navy yards. In those navy yards you have 14 large dry docks. On the South Atlantic coast you have not a single deep-water port, with the exception of the port of Charleston, which to-day has a channel 30 feet in depth from the sea to the navy yard. You are building battleships the draft of which was never contemplated when any navy yard was established. The deepest draft when this yard was established was considered to be 23 feet, and the commission that established this yard said that it was necessary to dredge one shoal in that river to deepen it to 25 feet, so as to carry the largest battleships in the Navy at that time. That was in 1901, but we have progressed in the building of battleships just as we have along other lines. We are delving a little deeper and expanding in our thoughts, in our actions, in our construction of battleships. The result is that the depth in 1901 and the depth in 1910 is not the depth necessary in 1918, nor the depth that will be necessary in 1921.

Therefore, when the Helm Commission made its report on this navy yard, and said it is strategically the ideal place to put a capital shipyard because of Charleston's expansive harbor, its fine river, its protection from storm, its freedom from bombardment, its ease to defend, and its accessibility to the sea, they joined in that report in saying that at a reasonable cost a depth of 35 to 40 feet could be secured in this river and this harbor, and, gentlemen, it ought to be put in this river and harbor. Now, with reference to cost and maintenance, the commission showed that the cost was reasonable. At that time only \$2,000,000 were received for the river and harbor; but, in addition to that, as it has been necessary in every navy yard in this country, we must have a turning basin opposite this yard. The result is, of course, additional cost. Now, they further showed in this very report, which is very illuminating, that the maintenance of this river to a depth of 40 feet is less by one-half than it is at New York, Philadelphia, and one other port. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] has harped upon the presence of silt in the river. It is not silt in the river which has to be dredged from the mouth of the dock. Every engineer who has examined into it says so. The only one I know of who does not hold this view is the gentleman from Illinois. It is the mud from the sides of the canal that lead into the dock which requires dredging. Now, in building the dock, not the yard, but the dock, they put it 700 feet from the channel of the river, and they cut through a mud bank. Now, my friends, the water flows over the sides of that canal twice a day, with the result that the erosion of the sides of that canal gets into the bottom of the canal, and necessarily that will keep up unless you dredge it until the sides reach the angle of rest, whatever that may be, under the circumstances of any given case. They have recommended time and again that the simplest and easiest way to stop the filling in at the mouth of the dock entirely is by building a sea wall along the two sides, which can be done at a reasonable cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as I understand the situation this amendment by the committee is opposed upon three or four different grounds. One ground suggested is that this committee met hastily and did not have hearings. Why, that is a reason for the passage of the amendment and not against it. It shows that there is necessity; it shows that it is a war measure. The Secretary of War sent letters to our committee and said that it is a war measure and that he urged our committee to adopt an amendment of that kind. He would not have asked its adoption at the last moment, after the bill had been reported and when it was impossible to have hearings, unless there was urgent need.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. So that instead of its being an argument against the proposition it is one for it.

Now, let us take the next proposition. Gentlemen say this is not a proper place at which to establish this yard. Well, now, upon what do they base that argument? They say that it is 6 miles inland upon this river. That is the statement and the argument of men without expert knowledge, and certainly it is in direct contradiction of a series of reports of all those who have investigated the matter and who, after a comparison of this port with other ports, say that Charleston is the best of all the ports south of Norfolk and between Norfolk and Key West for the purpose for which it is proposed to establish this dock.

On the other hand, what are the arguments in favor of the proposition? There is first the naked, bald statement of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the two experts on whom we ought to rely, because they are charged with the responsibility, and they say that this should be done. There is next the fact that, while to the north between the Canadian line and Norfolk each 250 miles there is a dock of this kind, south of Norfolk and down to Key West there is none at all, and there is that long stretch of coast in which a battle is likely to occur absolutely destitute of any place to which a battleship could go in case of being disabled or in case of disaster.

We say that one should be supplied, and we say that the natural place to supply it is midway between Key West and Norfolk—halfway, the natural distance. Now, gentlemen, let us go to the broader question. Every man upon the floor, I suppose, will join in this statement. From the fateful 6th of April, 1917, down to to-day every patriotic Member of this body has been ready to support the United States in anything which would help protect us against the common enemy and help to win this war; and shall we, without expert knowledge—shall we, in face of the statement of the Secretaries of War and Navy—

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY (continuing). Say that it is not necessary to do this thing; that it is not a war measure? I believe not. I believe we are unready to do that thing. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FREAR. The Secretary of War did not sign that letter, the gentleman will admit. He is not in this country at the present time. He presented statements to us of what he thought was necessary in reference to war measures, and we supported all of those. The statement I read from the engineers was to the effect that vessels can be brought in even at the 26-foot depth, and we have agreed to the 30-foot depth in the past.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Of course, the Secretary of War when he is not in this country can not sign letters individually. The Secretary of War is like any other man at the head of an executive department. When he goes away he leaves in charge a man next to him, and Mr. Crowell, Acting Secretary, signed this letter, and it is to be supposed that he had the same expert advice which would have been had by the Secretary of War had he been personally present. I can see nothing in the distinction to say it is not signed by the Secretary of War personally, but is signed by a deputy; but I say on broad grounds and on patriotic grounds, on the ground that since the 6th of April we have been voting for everything that has been proposed to us as a war measure, to save our fleets and provide for them if they are disabled between Key West and Norfolk, I ask you to vote for this amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, coming 100 miles from the seacoast and having no port anywhere nearer than that distance, I think I can claim that I approach this question without any interested motives.

It might be that everything that was said by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHALEY] could be taken as colored somewhat by the locality in which he lives, and the same might have been said of the distinguished gentleman from New York when he was so urgently advocating the depth of the channel at Hell Gate.

Again, I have heard certain gentlemen here criminate and recriminate in regard to the merits of this bill, saying it was founded on graft, and then saying, too, that it was a monumental pork issue. Now, that is not the question before this House. The question before this House is this: Is it needed at this time, and is the expenditure a proper one? If it is, we should vote for it irrespective of location, irrespective of the wishes of the gentleman who advocates it, and regardless of any locality or sectionalism.

Now, what are the facts? It seems we have no navy yard capable of doing this sort of work, all the way from Norfolk down to Key West. Certainly, there must be a station somewhere, and this seems to be halfway distant between the two points. Now, one would infer, other circumstances being equal, that this is the point for that station. But I hear my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, my fighting Quaker friend [Mr. BUTLER], for whom I have the greatest of all high regard, say that this is not a war measure. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There is no more patriotic citizen in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I say with all sincerity that there is no more patriotic citizen within the confines of the entire Union than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. [Applause.] But he is mistaken about this view. This is a war measure. I saw that Lloyd-George said only yesterday that this battle in France which is now being waged, called the great battle of the Somme, might last for eight months. I hope and pray with all of you that we may be successful in that issue. I hope the time will never come when we will have to fight here on these shores, but if the war continues, and there be not any immediate successful issue, we may have a war upon the seas. We must have the war upon the seas, and if we have the war upon the ocean, it will be at our door. And if we have vessels that cost \$28,000,000 each, as said by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, then this money being expended is a pittance. Four million dollars is only one-seventh of the price of one dreadnaught.

In other words, we are about to expend a portion of money here—for what? For the repair and upkeep and taking care of these dreadnaughts if it becomes necessary. More than that, I understand that there is not only one vessel of that kind being built but there are a number of them, and there is no place in the southern waters where there is draft enough to accommodate them.

They say Charleston is not the place. They say we ought to spend money in the West Indies, if you please. They say that it ought to be farther south. But we have already expended \$10,000,000, I understand, on this location, and why waste the \$10,000,000 already expended by not increasing this appropriation for opening this channel? It seems to me, then, from that point of view, that this is the thing to do at this time. More than that, I have heard some gentlemen say here that nobody could convince them that this was the proper site. Now, I approach this matter entirely with an open mind. I listened to the argument presented by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and very carefully gave full attention to it; I listened to the argument of the gentlemen on the other side who oppose this measure, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], and also the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON]. I was willing to be convinced, and am still willing to be convinced; but there are some people who, when convinced against their will, remain of the same opinion still. That is the trouble. I am willing to take the word and the authority of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am willing to take the word of the gentleman who is at the head of this Committee on Rivers and Harbors. More than that, I am fully willing and anxious to take the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, because I believe that they have honestly recommended this as a war measure and that we need it now. [Applause.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment appropriating the money for Charleston. I do not know who has the power to-day to tell whether this is a war-emergency measure or not. Four years ago no one would have dreamed of the great conflict that is being waged across the ocean. And after it started I did not find a man here in Washington who predicted that it would go longer than a year. Now, that war has continued for nearly four years, and it is yet undecided. I feel that it will require the power of this great Nation to win that conflict and possibly the finality of it may be decided on our shores. It was my pleasure last summer to visit Charleston, and my conclusion then was that large sums of money should be expended there for greater activities at that yard. I did not then know of the conclusion of the Helm commission. I realized that some day a great battle would be fought in

those waters; that we would have to fight to maintain the Monroe doctrine. That war will come after this war is concluded, no matter how it is concluded. Some day, unless we have the military and naval strength that will deter the enemy, we shall have to battle in those waters to maintain the Monroe doctrine; and we ought to safeguard ourselves in order to do it successfully.

If we could turn the hand of that clock back a few years there would be many things that we would do that we have left undone—that would have helped us in this terrible conflict. I am surprised at the utterances of some of these gentlemen in not being willing to visualize a little bit to-day, realizing the many missteps that we have made in the past. I want to follow the leadership of the military authorities and the naval authorities. I think this country would be in better position and that the war across the ocean would have been concluded ere this if we had done that before.

I am not going to make a mistake to-day. I shall vote for this appropriation. If a war should take place and a battle ensue in the Caribbean Sea, we would have \$200,000,000 worth of battleships there to fight for our liberty. We need these places, not only at Charleston, but we should have another great naval station a considerable distance down toward the West Indies.

Now, I hope my friends on this side will not be governed by any prejudicial view against this project. I have heard these prejudices expressed for a long time. I am happy to say I have not been infected by them, and I trust they will look to the future safety of our great country and act accordingly. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield? Did not the gentleman on several occasions vote against a dry dock and the extension of piers down there because he did not think that the Charleston Navy Yard should be built up as a great repair or construction yard?

Mr. FARR. I have no knowledge of ever having voted against this project. But if I did, I made a mistake, and I am happy now to remedy that mistake and do something for the future safety of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, if no other gentleman desires to speak, I will call for a vote.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I believe I was amongst those for whom time was reserved.

Mr. SMALL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it did not need the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WHEALEY] to convince me that this amendment ought to be adopted. But I want to compliment him upon the very clear presentation of the case which he has made. I am somewhat familiar with the situation at Charleston. I have observed from the commercial aspect of it that Charleston is recovering lost ground. A new railroad bringing coal from northern fields has come to Charleston. In many other ways the city has been going forward.

Charleston, situated geographically as it is, has as much right to be considered for a great navy yard or for a great dry dock as any other point along the coast. I am glad the gentleman from South Carolina has told in such clear terms the relationship of Charleston to the other cities along the Atlantic seaboard. What he says about the northern dry-dock situation is substantially true. I think, however, that he errs as to the depth of some of the channels leading up one or two of the rivers to which he has referred. Philadelphia, for instance, does not have 40 feet, although I wish it had. It is gradually acquiring an assured 35-foot channel, and yet it is 100 miles from the sea, and, as I indicated yesterday, is the busiest ship-building river in the United States. Baltimore has 35 feet assured. The problem for these two cities in the future will be to attain that 40 feet which Boston has in sight, and which was guaranteed to New York yesterday, and which will now come to Charleston eventually, if this amendment is adopted.

But as one coming from a Northern State, intensely interested in this question of the development of the Atlantic coast, and as one who has traversed that coast from Maine to Key West, I want to agree not only with the gentleman from South Carolina, but with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, that there ought to be a great naval dry dock south of Cape Hatteras.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. FESS. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Which I am not.

Mr. FESS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought he was.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have not that distinction,

Mr. FESS. Well, as a distinguished Member of the House who knows what that committee has done, why did not the committee put this amendment in?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. For the reason, apparently, which is indicated in the letter of the Secretary of the Navy, which was read at the Clerk's desk at the beginning of this debate.

Mr. FESS. It was rather a matter not of this committee but of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is a matter of the two committees, one of which, the Committee on Naval Affairs, had proposed to attain this object by action in the naval appropriation bill, and the other, apparently, was the effort of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to retain its jurisdiction by making provision here. As it presents itself to me there is a compromise here that will be satisfactory to both committees.

Mr. FESS. And the omission of the item by the committee is not necessarily an argument against it?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think not. This question would undoubtedly have come up in the naval appropriation bill, and by passing it now as a river and harbor measure I think it will be waived when the naval appropriation bill comes forward. I merely suspect that; I do not know.

Mr. PADGETT. The understanding between the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and myself was that if this committee passed it here it will go out of the naval bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That was the understanding I had from the discussion thus far.

Mr. FREAR. Does the gentleman know of any other item in the bill, by amendment or otherwise, where there is no report from the engineers and no hearings on the item? I will say that there is not to my knowledge.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know. Norfolk is the last point, the southernmost point, on the Atlantic seaboard where dry-dock accommodations can be had. Now, gentlemen, picture to yourselves a vessel in distress coming up from the Caribbean Sea, coming in from the ocean, coming around from the Gulf, that has no place to go until it reaches Norfolk.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The coast of Florida is more than 500 miles long. In November last I took a trip along the inland waters of Florida from the St. Johns River, Jacksonville, down to Key West, and I say to you that it is a reflection upon this Nation that there is no point along the coast of Florida, along its entire 500 miles of length, into which a vessel in distress at sea drawing 20 feet of water can go; not one; nor are there places anywhere along the coast from New Orleans yonder on the Gulf all the way around to Norfolk to which a naval vessel which is leaking or in bad repair can go to be placed in dry dock for repairs. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, in closing this discussion I just wish to say this: A provision for this dry dock at Charleston has been reported in the naval appropriation bill and will be considered when that bill comes before the House. No one can foretell with absolute certainty whether that provision in the naval appropriation bill will receive the approval of the House, although I believe the approval of the House will be given for the authorization of this dry dock. But if the dry dock shall be authorized in the naval appropriation bill and become an accomplished fact, is there a single Member of the House who would vote against deepening the channel from the sea to the navy yard in order to make the dry dock usable? No one would think of voting against an authorization for the deepening of the channel if the dry dock had been provided.

Now, this provision for deepening the channel does not become effective unless the dry dock shall be subsequently authorized, and if the dry dock is never authorized, the money will never be expended; so that upon those conditions it seems to me every remnant of objection to this amendment authorizing the deepening of the channel in Charleston harbor from the sea to the navy yard ought to be removed. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRITTEN. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 4.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Savannah Harbor and Savannah River below, at, and above Augusta, Ga.: For maintenance, \$100,000.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the appropriation of \$100,000, but I desire to call attention to a practice which is not just to the Army engineers.

In Document No. 337 of the Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, dated August 13, 1917, is a report upon Savannah Harbor. In that report the engineers oppose going on with the proposition which was offered at that time and under consideration. The engineer in charge, Col. Mills, makes this statement, that it is first necessary to complete the work that is being done in the harbor at Savannah before undertaking further extensions that he says will impose additional burdens upon the Federal Government in the way of outlay for construction in the first instance and subsequent expense for maintenance.

We are undertaking to prosecute certain other improvements in the harbor. Now, this statement was made by the engineer, and the report was made on August 17 last. Accompanying the report is a statement of the harbor commission of Savannah, signed by 11 members, saying that they did not want this extension attempted at this time; that they preferred to have the other work done. Yet the committee has sent this matter back to the Army engineers, asking them to give a new report, and this inside of a little over six months, in the face of the protest of the Savannah commission itself that it is not necessary, and in the face of the report of the engineer that we ought not to incur this unnecessary expense at this time. The House knows what the purpose of such an action is, to send it back to the engineers after they have given careful consideration and are supported by the people of Savannah themselves, to ask them now practically to make a different report. I say, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to support the engineers, if we are going to give them the assistance which we assume to give them here, and which has been claimed upon this floor, we ought not to take such action.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is the gentleman referring to anything that is in this present bill?

Mr. FREAR. No; I am not. I am referring to a practice that I think ought to be stopped, and if not stopped it ought to be exposed. When the engineers have reported upon a proposition of this kind, when they come in and say that certain work ought not to be proceeded with, and when they are supported by 11 members of the Harbor Commission saying the same thing, I say we ought not to send this back to them, upon the request of local interests, in order to have the engineers change their position.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is the gentleman asking the Committee of the Whole to take any affirmative steps?

Mr. FREAR. I am stating the action that the committee took against my protest, and which was favored by the gentleman who asks me the question. I am stating a fact which has a far closer relation to this bill than a good deal of the conversation that has occurred here on the floor to-day, and I think it is a very important proposition that the House should understand that when the engineers have just brought in a report, and they are supported in their action by the people of the locality, by 11 members of the Harbor Commission, we ought not to send the matter back to the engineers asking them to give a reexamination, which practically, of course, invites them to change their position.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Has the gentleman stated that certain of the members of that commission have changed their minds on that subject?

Mr. FREAR. Some of the members have done so within the past six months, because I think there are one or two interests that desire to have some special service given to them; but the engineer himself who made the examination says it is an undue expense to place upon the Government. Yet we send it back for reexamination.

Mr. DUPRÉ. You mean that the Committee of the Whole does?

Mr. FREAR. No; the Rivers and Harbors Committee, of which the gentleman is a member, and he voted to do it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Why revamp all these matters on this floor?

Mr. FREAR. Because the more we expose that practice the sooner we are going to defeat it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And, in the language of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the greater headlines somebody will get.

Mr. FREAR. No; but we are going to expose these things, and I assume that the gentleman has voted for all these propositions, and he can. I have no objection; but I want to show

what an unfair position it is in which to place the Army engineers.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I regret very much that the gentleman has had any objection to my voting for what I believe to be proper.

Mr. FREAR. No; of course the gentleman can pursue his own course.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to put into the Record a table having to do with the bill we are going to consider to-morrow.

During my absence in Nebraska the Provost Marshal General did me the honor to write a letter to members of the Military Committee, in which he challenged the correctness of some figures I had put into the Record showing the way in which the classification of men under the proposed law would affect the different counties in the State of Nebraska. The statement he made was that I had misinterpreted those figures.

The first column in the table shows the total number of men classified. The second shows those that were classified as he interpreted it, and who had accepted that classification, and the third column showed those who had appealed. The Provost Marshal General held that from the men who had appealed should have been deducted those who were put in the second column as class 1. In the letter he placed a table showing the classification of all the counties in the fifth district, and I think his own figures will convince anyone who examines them that the Provost Marshal General is in error in his contention. For instance, in the county of Clay his own figures show that 1,178 men were classified and that 264 were placed in class 1. He figures 22 per cent, therefore, in class 1; but the trouble with his figures is that in the next column it is shown that 343 men appealed from the classification of 264 in class 1.

In the county of Franklin, in the same district, 800 men were classified; and, according to his own figures, 152 were placed in class 1, and he figures 19 per cent; but the following column shows that 294 men appealed, apparently from a total of 152, which, of course, is absurd.

In Frontier County, in the same district, out of a total of 765 registrants, apparently only 114 were put in class 1, or 15 per cent, but from that 114 his own figures show that 322 appealed.

In the county of Hayes, in the same district, his figures show 283 registrants and 77 in class 1, which, he says, is 27 per cent only who were put in class 1, but 187 have appealed.

I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record the entire statement of the adjutant general of the State of Nebraska, showing the percentages of men who were supposed to be in class 1 in every county in the State, and showing that he is entirely in error in his contention by his own figures. If the appeals of those men who are pending are not granted, they also must be added to those listed in class 1. I wish to show that the adjutant general's own tables are proof positive that I was correct in my statement. I wish to put in the Record the full statement of the adjutant general of the State, including these tables, whose figures confirm my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record the statement and tables indicated by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement and tables are as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE LETTER FROM THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL GENERAL.

1. Mr. SHALLENBERGER's figures are incorrect. (See Exhibit A.) They are in some cases two or three times higher than the actual figures. The reason for this is that the returns were sent in under two heads, viz, total persons in class 1 and total class 1 cases pending. The former number was taken from column 8 of the classification list; the latter number was taken from column 15 of the classification list, and, of course, signified a duplicate number of persons and not an additional number; that is, those numbers of class 1 who appealed were, of course, included within the figures representing the total of class 1—e. g., if there were 150 placed in class 1 by a local board, and if there were 50 appeals, the persons making these appeals were part of the 150 in class 1.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, not understanding this, has added together the two figures; i. e., class 1 persons and class 1 persons appealing. Obviously in those districts where the numbers of appeals pending was large, the figures would, of course, be grossly exaggerated; for example, there are 9 boards in which the number of appeals pending are between 100 and 1,000, hence in these boards his erroneously high figures make it appear as though almost the entire body of classified persons were placed in class 1. For example, in taking the principal countries named in his speech:

(1) Seward County, with 1,287 classified, did not have 1,262 in class 1, but only 722; i. e., not 98 per cent but 56 per cent in class 1.

(2) Chase County, with 361 classified, instead of having 283 in class 1 has only 164; i. e., not 80 per cent but 45 per cent in class 1.

Thus in 9 out of the 20 boards cited by him the figure for class 1 is reduced, when corrected to sometimes one-third, or even one-fourth, of Mr. SHALLENBERGER's figures.

The gross inequalities thus emphasized by him do not exist.

Nebraska—Fifth congressional district.

Local board of city or county.	Code No.	Total registrants.	Boards' action on first draft.				Boards' action on classification.				
			Number called.	Exemption claims disallowed.		Certified for service.		Number classified.	Class 1.		Pending.
				Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.		Number.	Per cent.	
Adams.....	26-2-1	1,925	429	104	51	230	54	1,785	622	35	107
Chase.....	26-2-4	398	102	4	11	56	55	351	164	45	19
Clay.....	26-2-5	1,239	379	17	10	134	35	1,178	264	22	343
Dundy.....	26-2-6	429	160	1	2	61	38	375	71	19	9
Franklin.....	26-2-8	853	150	15	28	72	48	800	152	19	294
Frontier.....	26-2-9	839	293	25	17	130	47	765	114	15	322
Furnas.....	26-2-10	932	423	11	6	135	32	846	84	10	4
Gosper.....	26-2-12	422	170	7	8	62	36	389	59	16	201
Hall.....	26-2-13	2,206	500	62	26	219	44	1,943	484	25	12
Harlan.....	26-2-15	781	186	36	37	83	42	715	157	22	15
Hayes.....	26-2-16	324	150	13	23	68	45	283	77	27	187
Hitchcock.....	26-2-17	493	242	26	31	74	31	335	85	25	4
Kearney.....	26-2-20	837	373	56	50	167	45	763	207	27	81
Nuckolls.....	26-2-25	1,098	364	13	8	114	31	1,010	365	36	259
Perkins.....	26-2-28	311	65	3	8	21	32	295	69	23	1
Phelps.....	26-2-29	936	350	20	9	148	42	855	285	33	104
Red Willow.....	26-2-31	979	264	10	7	95	39	892	150	17	5
Webster.....	26-2-37	942	250	6	6	89	36	839	170	20	48
Range of variation.....					2-51		31-55			10-45	

County.	Men classified.	Class I men.		Class I men's classification pending before district boards.		County.	Men classified.	Class I men.		Class I men's classification pending before district boards.	
		Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.			Number.	Per cent.	Number.	Per cent.
Adams.....	1,785	622	34.83	107	40.83	Logan.....	159	47	29.56	4	32.07
Antelope.....	1,206	156	12.93	0	12.93	Loup.....	154	39	25.37	25	25.32
Arthur.....	142	19	13.37	1	14.07	McPherson.....	128	34	26.56	2	28.12
Banner.....	144	31	21.52	1	22.22	Madison.....	1,876	322	17.16	12	17.80
Boone.....	1,132	292	25.79	7	26.41	Merriam.....	873	174	19.93	15	21.65
Box Butte.....	776	236	30.41	53	37.42	Morrill.....	874	217	24.82	13	26.30
Boyd.....	574	75	13.06	0	13.06	Nance.....	753	107	14.29	5	14.87
Brown.....	455	113	24.83	1	25.05	Nemaha.....	989	276	28.16	82	36.53
Buffalo.....	1,039	423	21.42	2	21.92	Nuckolls.....	1,010	365	36.13	250	60.89
Burt.....	1,161	229	18.91	20	20.65	Otoe.....	1,573	383	24.53	191	38.67
Butler.....	1,275	225	17.67	35	20.38	Pawnee.....	769	193	25.39	4	25.93
Cass.....	1,593	391	24.73	90	30.94	Perkins.....	295	69	23.38	1	23.70
Cedar.....	1,408	388	27.56	12	28.40	Phelps.....	855	283	33.45	104	45.61
Chase.....	961	164	45.48	119	78.39	Pierce.....	881	175	19.67	26	22.60
Cherry.....	1,174	344	29.30	8	20.98	Platte.....	1,743	417	23.88	50	28.74
Cheyenne.....	768	302	39.32	3	39.71	Polk.....	877	192	21.87	4	22.35
Clay.....	1,178	261	22.71	343	39.71	Red Willow.....	892	159	16.81	5	17.37
Cliff.....	1,041	217	20.84	28	23.53	Richardson.....	1,622	333	20.90	7	21.30
Colfax.....	1,259	324	25.92	14	27.04	Rock.....	311	62	19.93	1	20.25
Cumming.....	2,058	363	17.65	15	18.38	Saline.....	1,447	391	20.80	89	21.95
Custer.....	506	196	37.88	0	32.88	Sarpy.....	747	175	23.42	1	23.68
Dakota.....	833	217	26.05	14	27.73	Saunders.....	1,697	667	39.71	665	79.90
Dawson.....	1,402	194	13.83	2	12.98	Scotts Bluff.....	1,593	255	15.94	4	18.19
Deuel.....	313	84	26.83	3	27.78	Seward.....	1,287	722	56.09	540	98.05
Dixon.....	960	210	21.87	0	21.87	Sheridan.....	839	193	23.36	8	24.31
Dodge.....	2,035	600	29.48	36	31.25	Sherman.....	747	134	17.93	5	18.62
Douglas.....	1,928	538	28.43	13	30.13	Sioux.....	391	89	20.45	7	22.25
Omaha.....						Stanton.....	707	145	20.65	2	20.93
Division No. 1.....	2,961	1,867	62.56	20	63.99	Thayer.....	1,131	243	21.75	15	23.07
Division No. 2.....	3,001	752	25.05	9	25.35	Thomas.....	154	55	35.71	1	37.01
Division No. 3.....						Thurston.....	831	293	35.38	167	56.97
Division No. 4.....	4,303	1,681	39.06	69	40.67	Valley.....	811	184	22.68	10	23.92
Division No. 5.....	3,272	1,137	34.75	30	35.60	Washington.....	985	244	24.77	6	25.38
Dundy.....	575	71	18.93	9	21.33	Wayne.....	939	247	26.55	14	28.06
Fillmore.....	1,113	219	19.75	70	25.28	Webster.....	831	179	20.20	48	25.97
Franklin.....	899	132	14.90	294	55.75	Wheeler.....	173	34	19.31	5	22.18
Frontier.....	765	111	9.92	322	59.98	York.....	1,481	291	19.72	100	24.35
Furnas.....	846	84	9.92	4	19.49	Total.....	193,491	27,351			
Gage.....	2,443	794	32.50	1,011	74.00	Class I, not appeals.....					
Garden.....	439	147	32.66	16	30.22	Class I, appeals.....				6,330	
Garfield.....	291	54	20.68	9	24.13	Total registrants placed in class I by local boards.....		33,681	32.5		
Gosper.....	389	59	15.32	201	63.42						
Grant.....	196	66	35.31	5	17.99						
Groesbeck.....	728	126	17.30	12	25.52						
Hall.....	1,943	484	24.90	45	23.61						
Hamilton.....	1,241	248	19.98	15	24.65						
Harlan.....	715	157	21.95	187	98.28						
Hayes.....	283	77	27.20	4	28.56						
Hitchcock.....	235	85	25.37	4	17.92						
Holt.....	1,417	259	17.64	4	15.62						
Hood.....	128	20	15.62	13	28.53						
Howard.....	882	221	25.39	148	37.08						
Jefferson.....	1,313	347	26.63	51	25.66						
Johnson.....	834	191	20.50	81	37.74						
Kearney.....	763	202	27.12	2	35.80						
Keith.....	444	157	35.36	1	34.93						
Kearney.....	306	107	34.93	1	25.15						
Kimball.....	320	89	25.00	243	51.50						
Knox.....	1,599	576	36.22								
Lincoln.....											
Lincoln, division No. 1.....	2,935	674	22.96	9	23.26						
Lincoln, division No. 2.....	1,737	284	15.90	4	16.12						
Lincoln.....	1,513	361	23.97	23	25.49						

32.5 per cent of registrants liable for service are in class I.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask my colleague from Nebraska whether or not he still is of opinion that he is not in error in his former statement where he gave the figures from the county. I think 1,280 and some odd, and 1,270 were put in class I. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not he has verified his figures, and whether or not he was not mistaken?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The figures are in The Adjutant General's report. It is the county of Seward; and that report shows that there were 1,287 classified; 722 were put in class I,

or 56.09 per cent. Five hundred and forty men have appealed, and The Adjutant General has put the figures in percentages, 98.5. These figures are his, and I want to put them in the Record to show that I used the official figures. It is a marvelous thing; but if you go over the figures you will find that the Provost Marshal General's contention is impossible. Take the county of Gage, in the district of my colleague, Mr. SLOAN, and in that county there are 2,443 registrants; 794 put in class 1—32.5 per cent—according to the figures of the adjutant general of Nebraska. One thousand and fourteen men have appealed. Does it mean that only 794 were put in class 1 by the local board in that county? No; it means what the adjutant general has indicated—that 794 men have accepted and 1,014 have appealed. If the 1,014 are denied the appeal, then the entire amount is in class 1.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I want to clear this one thing up. I want to ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether he has taken any steps to investigate the board that would make that sort of a return?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I have not; but while in Nebraska I called on a number of counties and asked for the reason of this tremendous difference in classification, and I was informed that it resulted from the interpretation and understanding of the law by the draft boards. One county would only put 10 per cent of the total registration in class 1, while another county, according to these figures, would put 90 per cent in class 1. It results from the action of these local boards.

I want the House to understand that the classification list I am inserting in the Record is furnished me by the adjutant general of Nebraska after I wired the governor for it. I asked the report to show the total number of registrants and the number of them placed in class 1 by local boards. The percentage figures, which were made by the Nebraska office, plainly show that he furnished me the total placed in class 1, placed those who accepted their classification in the second column, and those who appealed in the third, and by the final percentage figures the total percentage of those registrants of draft age who would be in class 1 unless appeals were granted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sapelo and Darien Harbors, Cowhead and Satilla Rivers, Club, Plantation, and Fancy Bluff Creeks, Ga.; and St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.: For maintenance, \$4,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 25, strike out "Club, Plantation."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, that is to correct a clerical error. Club and Plantation Creeks should not have been in that group because they are provided for otherwise. I will ask unanimous consent to print a letter from the Secretary of War suggesting the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes outside of the regular order, because I have a matter that I want to call to the attention of the House in relation to the charges against the aviation section of the Army.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this foreign to this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

Mr. FOSTER. That matter is coming up to-morrow, and I do not think it ought to be taken up at this particular time.

Mr. CALDWELL. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, \$40,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not want to be persistent about this matter, but there is continuously published in the newspapers criticism of the Army of the United States in relation to its endeavor to create an air service. The matter has got to be so important to the public, and the public is so greatly disturbed about it, that it is absolutely necessary that something be done to clarify the situation as it stands. Now, it so happens that I am chairman of the subcommittee on aviation.

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman made a personal appeal to have five minutes for this, and I hope no objection will be made.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman may be justified in coming to the defense of the Aviation Service, but it seems to me rather unusual to inject a controversy of this

sort into the river and harbor bill. Undoubtedly some other gentleman might desire to justify the criticism that has been made. If that is so, controversy would run along here for quite a little time.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will say to the gentleman that the other day the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] took some time of the House on a matter foreign to the bill, and I made no objection to it.

Mr. GILLET. But that was in general debate.

Mr. WALSH. That was general debate, and the gentleman had a right to do it.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have not taken much time of the House at this session.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee says that he is willing that the gentleman should proceed, and I will not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose if gentlemen desire to answer the gentleman from New York there will be no objection on the part of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALDWELL. In order that we may know whether the Army has fallen down in its endeavor to build up an air service or not, we must consider the condition of the country at the time it undertook to make an army in the air to supply us with the necessary equipment and compare that with the accomplishments.

When war was declared there were in the Nation about 156 men who could fly, and not one of them was skilled in the kind of flying that must be learned in order that they could take part in military combat. As compared with that condition, we find that to-day America has in its Army alone 2,700 qualified pilots and 9,100 graduates of ground schools, besides the thousands in the flying and ground schools. Each day the men in the flying schools fly over 156,000 miles, or more than six times the distance around the earth. Of these, large numbers are now actually flying on the battle front in France, and it is considered by our enemy and our allies that they are the most daring and the most efficient fliers in the world. [Applause.]

Shortly after war was declared every business organization in America that could make or thought it could make aircraft was invited to Washington for consultation, and after a careful and exhaustive examination of their plants and equipment it was found that, even though Great Britain and France had stimulated aircraft production in America in every way that limitless money could induce by offering to pay any kind of profit that the American manufacturer demanded, it was freely admitted that we could not construct more than 630 airplanes in America in a single year, and it was not expected that these factories could be expanded so as to make them able to produce more than 1,500 planes in 18 months. To illustrate the kind of stimulation that the allies had furnished for the development of this infant manufacturing industry it might be well to relate the story often told concerning the Curtiss plant. It seems that the purchasing agent of Great Britain, being ordered to supply a large quantity of aircraft, called the Curtiss factory on the telephone and asked Mr. Curtiss how many planes he could make in a year, and on receiving the reply asked if he could not increase his output. Mr. Curtiss replied that he could if he had the money, and the English agent said, "How much do you need?" Mr. Curtiss replied, "One hundred thousand," meaning dollars. The English agent said, "All right; I'll mail you a draft." When Mr. Curtiss opened his mail the next morning he nearly dropped dead, for the draft was for 100,000 pounds instead of dollars.

The fact, however, that the reports of the newspapers and of the Senate committee seem to overlook, demonstrates that the manufacturers of America have thought more of their country than they have of European money, for to-day they are actually manufacturing more than a thousand airplanes every month, and the production is increasing every day. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. While the gentleman is going into a defense of this I simply want to ask my colleague if there has not been a tremendous fall-down from the promises made to the Committee on Military Affairs when the appropriation of \$640,000,000 was being passed?

Mr. CALDWELL. Not from the promises made by any Army officer that I recall, but from the promises made in the newspapers and by men who took up the matter after we had appropriated the \$640,000,000 and the idea of an army in the air had become popular.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Did not the Secretary of War make a direct statement as to the number of airplanes expected to be delivered in France by the 1st of July?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not remember any such statement having been made to the committee.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. How many combat planes have we now?

Mr. CALDWELL. We have in France to-day 185 combat planes, of which 5 were manufactured in the United States, put in boxes here, and sent to France. In addition to that, we have 1,220 training planes in France.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. All but five of these machines are of foreign make and purchased by us under agreement with the allies. They are now being used by the American aviators in France.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. How many fighting planes did the gentleman say?

Mr. CALDWELL. One hundred and eighty-five.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Are they equipped with Liberty motors?

Mr. CALDWELL. Not all of these, as I understand it, but surely five of them are.

Mr. GILLET. The gentleman does not distinguish between fighting planes and combat planes. I do not think there is a single fighting plane in France made in the United States. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. CALDWELL. There is no difference. I am not mistaken. The gentleman probably refers to the single-seater. None have been built here because Gen. Pershing has requested that we do not build any here.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think it proper to make all this public?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes; I do think so, because before I got these figures I told the Army officer who gave them to me that I expected to make them public in a speech and that I did not want any information that would be improper to tell for fear that our enemy might learn facts of military importance, and he told me that he was giving me figures that were old enough, so that even if Germany knew them it would do no harm to the Army, because the situation was improving so rapidly. In addition to this, I feel that in view of the criticism that has come of the activities of this line of preparation that it is necessary to give the people facts upon which they can form their judgment as to the justification of the criticism and the character of the men making it.

There are three kinds of criticism. First, criticism coming from strong, energetic, patriotic Americans who are straining in the traces and anxious that we should enter this war in the big, American way. That kind of criticism is healthy and sought by all public officials who are anxious to do their duty. There is a second sort of criticism coming from people who have strangely mixed motives, either partisan or political, personal or biased, or selfish or mercenary. Some aim to obtain political preferment by tearing down through unfair criticism the administration that is responsible at this time. Some seek to injure those against whom they have personal spite or who have failed to grant favors requested. And still others have machinery and equipment that they would like to sell the Government at an exorbitant profit regardless of the adaptability of the appliances. To this kind of criticism we should give but little heed, except that it creates a reservoir for much of the third kind of criticism, namely, that coming from those who are disloyal and seek to defeat our country by disseminating insidious propaganda tending to destroy the confidence of our people in the Commander in Chief of our Army.

It is admitted that the airplane program is not as far advanced as it was hoped a year ago it would be at this time. But the delay has not been very great when the obstacles encountered are considered.

When we began to coordinate the industry of the country for the purpose of producing aircraft in quantity our first unforeseen obstacle came in the discovery that the most essential wood used in airplane construction (spruce) was available in such limited quantities that we could not supply our allies with the timber they required without going into new fields and adopting new and radical methods of curing the timber. There was in sight about 14,000,000 feet of spruce timber at the time we started our plan of production, and the allies required 28,000,000 feet. Our men have gone into primeval forests, constructed new mills, and during the past year have actually cut about 30,000,000 feet of lumber and will provide 100,000,000 feet this year.

The next unforeseen obstacle was the disloyal operations of the I. W. W., which had a strong working organization among the loggers and lumbermen of the Northwest. To combat this our Army officers organized the Loyal Legion of Loggers and Lumbermen, and have, I believe, effectively put out of business in the lumber region the pernicious, disloyal, and un-American I. W. W. We have to-day 10,000 men in uniform armed with axes fighting for American liberty. [Applause.]

It was then discovered that though there were many factories in America that were thought by their owners to be capable of constructing aircraft, after examination the owners refused

to take contracts because of the great change necessary in their plant and equipment. Although at the beginning there were only three airplane factories in the United States and a half dozen or more shops making experimental planes, to-day more than 400 manufacturing companies are working on contracts or subcontracts in the construction of aircraft and their accessories, employing more than 100,000 men. [Applause.]

It was later discovered that there was not enough linen in the world to cover the airplanes being constructed for the Army, and after much patient labor by many of our most skilled experts a substitute was finally devised, and the Government has acquired practically all the long-fiber staple cotton crop, at a cost of about \$14,000,000. We have purchased 34 tons of linen thread, to make up the deficiency of the amount required in our program. Strange as it may seem, the market is well supplied with the silk thread required. In the construction of the fuselage a different kind of wood is used, but cut into thin strips called in the art "laminated wood." If these strips we have already prepared for this purpose were laid on the ground, as they say in Ohio, "side by side," they would cover more than a thousand acres. [Applause.]

The next obstacle encountered seemed almost insurmountable, for the great Liberty motor, concerning which I will later make some remarks, would not properly function with any lubricant except castor oil. On inquiry it was found there was not castor oil enough in the world to meet our requirements, and there were not enough castor beans in America to sow the fields. To meet this almost overwhelming obstacle we sent a ship to India and brought back a load of castor beans, and have actually planted 100,000 acres of land in the United States from which we expect to manufacture all of the castor oil that our program may require. [Applause.]

We are about 90 days behind in our manufacturing schedule, and some of this has been made up from foreign purchases. Most of it was caused by two sources: First, when we laid out our program the allies, knowing what our equipment was, suggested that we devote our energy to the manufacture of training planes and the preparation of our men to fly therein, with the understanding that as fast as they were sent abroad the allies would supply them with combat machines and training on the front. We have kept our share of the program in that we have manufactured more training planes than we could use here, building up a reserve supply, and have manufactured all of the advanced training planes that we have had use for. We have sent 26,000 men abroad, of whom 7,000 are mechanics, and we have shipped 11,000 tons of material to France. Second, by change of plan under orders from France.

Of these, 3 squadrons of 18 planes each are now actually operating under the American flag and under American control, yet our Army holds only a 4-mile sector, and there are a great number of our men flying with England, with France, and with Italy in foreign machines and under foreign control in preparation of joining American units after they have had experience with the veterans of the allies. And I am authorized to state that we have not a single flying officer ready to go over the front that is without a combat plane and its equipment. [Applause.]

In the training of our pilots the casualties have been remarkably small. We have lost 26 officers, 42 cadets, and 17 enlisted men through accident. In other words, we have had one fatality for every 300,000 miles flown. Flying in an Army airplane has become safer than automobiling in the crowded city streets.

We have already constructed, tested, and have ready for service 264 Liberty engines, concerning which there has been so much criticism; 18 of them are now being used by the Army and a larger number by the Navy. Forty engines have been sent to our allies; quantity production has started and they will be delivered in increasing numbers. That the motors are a success is proved by the fact that our allies have asked us to send them as many engines as we can spare.

The Liberty motor produces a horsepower at less than 2 pounds and 100 horsepower more than any other motor being used on the battle front to-day, with approximately 100 pounds less weight. There is no question but that the Liberty engine will fly the combat plane recommended by Gen. Pershing faster than any other engine now available, and I feel sure that when the war is over the Liberty engine will stand out as one of the great accomplishments of the war, and I am only sorry that the man who conceived the idea—Maj. Souther—could not have lived to see its success. The delay in turning out quantity production is amply justified in the efficiency of the machine developed. The same applause will come here that came on the test of the Browning gun which had been adopted by the Ordnance Department following the Lewis gun controversy. I am sorry to say that a great portion of the criticism of the Liberty motor has come from men interested in other types of engines,

which they had hoped to have adopted by the Government, notwithstanding the fact that they were not so powerful as the engine we have developed; and certain men, for partisan and personal reasons, have repeated these criticisms, thus giving them credence.

I know, of course, that a great many of the statements that I have made will be challenged in the Senate and by certain Members of this House who have too much partisanship. I have been extremely careful in giving figures and making declarations of fact, and I am willing to stand on the statements I have made. I am satisfied that time will show that I was not only justified in making these statements but that the critics of the administration will be put to rout by public opinion when the facts are known.

We are to be congratulated that we have had at the head of our Air Service men like Maj. Gen. George O. Squier, Col. E. A. Deeds, and Col. H. H. Arnold, who have had the character to do the right thing in the face of complaints from high places and to withstand pressure exerted in behalf of those who sought favor at the expense of efficiency and urged hurry instead of care. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Indian River, St. Lucie Inlet, Miami Harbor (Biscayne Bay), and harbor at Key West, Fla.: For maintenance, \$20,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 6, by inserting, after line 8, the following paragraph: "Key West Harbor, Fla.: For improvement by deepening to a depth of 26 feet, where necessary, and by removal of what is commonly known as the 'middle ground' to a width of 800 feet, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 185, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document, \$150,000."

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment which I have just sent up.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that a committee amendment? I wish to reserve the point of order. It is rather ambiguous whether it is a harbor improvement or for the removal of water hyacinths.

Mr. SMALL. It is not a committee amendment.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I send up a substitute. There is no use of wasting time, because I am not offering this simply to talk.

Mr. STAFFORD. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the gentleman is offering two amendments at one and the same time, one an amendment and the other a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood.

Mr. SEARS. I am offering a substitute to my amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not do that. The gentleman can not offer a thousand and one amendments at one and the same time.

Mr. SEARS. Then I offer the substitute and I withdraw the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be permitted to withdraw the amendment just read, and he offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 6, by inserting, after line 8, the following paragraph: "Key West Harbor, Fla.: For improvement by deepening to a depth of 26 feet, where necessary, and by removal of what is commonly known as the 'middle ground' to a depth of 800 feet, in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 165, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session, \$150,000: *Provided*, That authority to enter into a contract in an amount not to exceed \$232,700, the full amount of the estimate, if satisfactory bids are received, or to purchase, construct, or hire a suitable dredging plant and do the work therewith, is hereby given if it is found that an advantageous contract can not be made."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I would say for the gentleman's information that this is for the improvement of Key West Harbor, and I have simply followed the recommendation of the Board of Engineers, quoting their language, in order that this work might be done as they decided it should be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman embodies in his amendment an authorization for the purchase of a dredging plant, as I understand it.

Mr. SEARS. Well, that was the recommendation of the Board of Engineers, which I will read to you at the proper time, so they could proceed with the work if they could not get a contract which was advantageous to the Government. In other words, the Government would do the work.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reserve the right to object so that the gentleman can explain it.

Mr. SEARS. I will strike that part out if the point of order is reserved. I will strike out the dredging part and offer it as

an amendment. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I suggest the gentleman ask for 10 minutes.

Mr. SEARS. Well, I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, before making the request, I have sat here and listened to gentlemen talk about war and everything else and I have made no objection, but patiently listened. I can not present this matter fairly to the committee in even 15 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Did not the gentleman prior to the beginning of general debate suggest that he would waive his time in general debate and take time under the five-minute rule?

Mr. SEARS. I did, and it was practically agreed to. I made the statement when general debate was up that I would not take any time of the House in general debate, because I only proposed to take time on this amendment, and the chairman stated that he hoped nobody would object.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I objected because the gentleman does this whenever the river and harbor bill is up. He refuses to take time under general debate but proceeds to ask for time under the five-minute rule, and I shall object to any further time beyond 10 minutes.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman objected, because I have tried to deal frankly and fairly with colleagues. I would like to talk about this in general terms, but on account of my limited time, I have to be not only specific, but speak very, very rapidly. Key West Harbor, as you know, is located at the southernmost point of Florida. There has not been a single dollar appropriated for it since 1913. In 1911, \$25,000; in 1912, \$63,000; and in 1913, \$15,000 was appropriated. Not a single dollar, in a single river and harbor bill, has been appropriated for maintenance or for any other purpose since 1913, and practically nothing for the three years prior thereto, notwithstanding the fact that in 1909 the commerce was 129,125 tons and value \$15,878,120, and in 1915 the commerce was \$26,026,547 and 946,736 tons. In 1917 the commerce was over \$37,051,579 and 1,028,374 tons, and this notwithstanding the fact that some steamers had to be withdrawn from Key West Harbor because practically every time one of them would enter the port it would run aground, and it would take two or three days to get it off. Now, I do not want you to take my word for it, and I will therefore read you what others say. First I want to call your attention to page 8, part 1, of Report of Chief of Engineers, United States Army, 1917, in which you will find Key West has been established as a permanent sea-coast defense. On June 13, 1917, the Secretary of War submitted a report to Congress, and it was published in House Document No. 185, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session. You can get this report, and each of you can verify what I am going to say. I will read to you these indorsements, but I will have to do so briefly and as rapidly as possible. The first indorsement is signed by W. M. Black, brigadier general. On page 2 of said document you will find the following or second indorsement:

After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in the views of the district officer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and therefore report that the improvement by the United States of Key West Harbor, Fla., with a view of removing the Middle Ground is deemed advisable to the extent of widening the channel opposite the wharves to a width of 800 feet and a depth of 26 feet at mean low water, at an estimated cost of \$232,700. The first appropriation should provide \$150,000 and authority to enter into contract for the full amount of the estimate, if satisfactory bids are received, or to purchase, construct, or hire a suitable dredging plant, and do the work therewith, if it is found that an advantageous contract can not be made, the balance of the estimate to be appropriated as needed.

The above is dated June 11, 1917, after war had been declared and after the House had passed the rivers and harbors bill last year. I tried to get this report at that time, but it had not been printed, and I lost my amendment.

The third indorsement is by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

Key West Harbor lies on the west front of the city of Key West, Fla. There are two improved channels, one from the south and one from the northwest.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida is making a very interesting statement, and I would like to have order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman, and I want to apologize for speaking so rapidly. I have a proposition full of merit.

The existing project now in force provides for a channel through the northwest entrance 17 feet deep at mean low water and of sufficient width for navigation, and for deepening and widening the main ship channel so as to afford a channel 30 feet deep at mean low water and 300 feet wide, and for removing certain shoals from the anchorage. There is now available a depth of 18 feet through the northwest channel and a depth of 30 feet and a width of not less than 300 feet through the main ship channel. The total expenditure on this work to June 30, 1916, has been \$741,096.94. A draft of 26 feet can be carried at low water to the wharves along the city front in the inner harbor. The mean tidal range is 2.6 feet at the northwest entrance and 1.4 feet in the main ship channel. Opposite the city front is a submerged reef, referred to as the Middle Ground, which restricts the width of the inner harbor, particularly in front of the Mallory wall. Key West has been growing in importance as a commercial port, and vessels regularly engaged in trade, as well as those making occasional stops, have been increasing in size. The larger ones now find difficulty in maneuvering to and from their berths because of insufficient width. Groundings are not of infrequent occurrence, and, as the bottom is generally of rock, these groundings are fraught with more than ordinary danger. It is believed that some additional width is required to keep pace with the expansion of commerce and that the project proposed by the district officer is well adapted to meet the needs of the locality. The board therefore concurs in the opinion of the district officer and the division engineer that it is advisable for the United States to undertake the additional work contemplated by estimates (b) above at a cost of \$232,700.

The remainder of this section is practically the same as the recommendation of Gen. Black, and is signed by Frederic V. Abbot, colonel, Corps of Engineers, now Brigadier General, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. That is the third indorsement.

The fourth and following indorsement is by Mr. George E. Brown, superintendent, Engineer Department at Large, in same document, and is included in the report of Lieut. Col. W. B. Ladue, Corps of Engineers:

7. The field work of the preliminary examination was executed by Mr. George E. Brown, superintendent, Engineer Department at Large, from whose report the following is quoted:

"Complaints relative to the difficulty and danger experienced by vessels maneuvering in this portion of the channel have frequently been made in the past when the vessels using it were neither so great in number nor of so great draft. Vessels of comparatively small tonnage and moderate draft have experienced difficulty, delay, and damage in many cases by the insufficiency in width of channel of the area in question.

"Opposite three of the most important of the commercial wharves (Mallory, P. & O. Steamship Co., and Porter Dock Co.), and a scant 500 feet distant from the front of the Mallory Wharf, is the point of Frankford Bank at a depth of 19 feet at mean low water. For an available depth of 24 feet at this point the width is further reduced to 400 feet. When vessels are lying at these wharves—and they almost invariably are—the situation is further complicated by less available space in which the moving ship can maneuver without causing damage to other vessels or the risk of grounding themselves. The bottom throughout the length of this channel in front of all wharves with a depth exceeding 20 feet is bare rock.

"All vessels are compelled to turn in landing at or leaving the wharves; except under the most favorable conditions of wind and tide vessels of comparatively small tonnage are almost invariably delayed, and in many cases have been damaged, in making this turn; frequently they ground here, and in some cases have lain aground for several days—in one case for a week—and release themselves finally only by lightening ship by the removal of cargo or other weight.

"The improvement of the Main Ship Channel has permitted the entrance of larger and deeper draft vessels to the outer harbor. The benefits to shipping are not increased in corresponding degree by reason of the fact that these do not have access to the wharves for discharging or loading cargo or taking on fuel or to the inner harbor for shelter for lack of swinging room.

"The channel along the wharves is considered inadequate for safe and economical navigation by the masters of vessels now using it. It imposes prohibitive limitations to prospective expansion. Two new vessels are now building to be added to lines giving regular service to the port, one of which is considerably larger and deeper than any of the vessels previously used; the owners state that the channel is not adequate for the accommodation of this vessel. The port is being investigated and (contingent on its further improvement) is under consideration for a general coal and fuel-oil station for commercial shipping. Among the advantages claimed for it as a fuel port for bunkers are that it is only 6 miles off the regular course for all ships sailing from the Gulf to ports in the Eastern Hemisphere and that ships may load at all seasons to summer load line when bound to southern European ports as against the winter load-line limitation when bunkering north of Cape Hatteras during the winter season. It is stated as a fact by the interests who have investigated this question that the time saved and the extra cargo carried will offset the increased price of local coal. Because of the shorter haul, oil can be supplied here cheaper than at other ports where bunkering would be confined to local shipping.

"The commerce of the port is steadily increasing. During the year 1915 there was an increase of more than 50 per cent over the preceding year. Commerce during the current year has exceeded that for 1915 from present indications.

"The area proposed for improvement by the parties to the several communications is, in my opinion, unnecessarily large for present needs. It is my opinion, corroborated by the masters of vessels with whom I have consulted, that the removal of the southerly projection of Frankford Bank and the extensions formed by isolated shoal spots, will be adequate for the immediate requirements of ships now operating or under construction for this port. The depth should be 26 feet at mean low water. The removal of the southerly projection of the Middle Ground, while admittedly desirable for a commodious anchorage and for easy access to the Northwest Channel, is an undertaking of larger proportions than present necessity would warrant.

"Considering Key West and the territory immediately contiguous to it, with relation to commodities of purely local origin and destination, the productive possibilities now seem limited. Considered in its rela-

tion to transit freight and passengers and through shipping, its possibilities are very great. The present expansion of this business, in so far as it relates to shipments to the island of Cuba, has been limited only by the ability to provide equipment with sufficient rapidity to handle it. Large quantities of freight in transit to other Gulf ports are carried by vessels calling at Key West. This is not shown in the tabulation of commerce submitted for the port, yet the fact that deep-draft ships are enabled to make this a port of call, loaded to maximum draft, permits of the profitable operation of these ships.

"The deep harbor of Key West has made possible the salvage of many vessels that have suffered damage or disaster. Improvements offer possibilities of benefits not only to local commerce but to a vast quantity of general commerce navigating these waters.

"The channel in the inner harbor is inadequate for the class of vessels now operating. It imposes distinct limitations on prospective expansion. It is believed the consistent growth indicated in the past two years will steadily continue. I believe this improvement to be urgent and necessary to future development of the commerce of this port and recommend its favorable consideration."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS. Fifth indorsement is dated December 1, 1916, and is as follows:

The narrowness of the inner harbor, however, particularly at the point of the submerged bank opposite the Mallory Wharf, causes considerable difficulty in the handling of the large vessels now frequenting the port.

6. The improvement particularly desired by parties interested in this project is the removal of a strip along the eastern side of the lower end of Frankford Bank, opposite the city front, to a depth of 25 or 26 feet at mean low water, and of width sufficient to give ample space for large vessels to maneuver to and from the wharves. More broadly viewed, the removal to a depth of 26 feet, of the entire lower end of Frankford Bank and of the Middle Ground proper, south and east of a line extending northeastwardly through buoys N8 and C15 NW., is desired, with a view to greatly increasing the anchorage area opposite the town, and opening up the southern end of the Northwest Channel. Some of those favoring the improvement ask the removal of the entire area of both banks south of latitude 24° 34', as shown on the Coast Survey chart.

13. The width of the channel opposite the city water front is not sufficient for the safe maneuvering of large vessels. When a vessel is lying at the face of the Mallory Wharf the available space for large vessels to pass is inconveniently narrow, particularly when the tide is running strong. So long as the commerce of the port was small, and was handled in small vessels, this condition caused no serious complaint; but with the increase in size of ships and in the volume of the freight movement, the difficulties of navigation here have steadily increased. Vessels frequently ground on the submerged bank, with loss of time and sometimes more or less serious damage and expense for tug hire and lighterage. Forwarding agents claim that they have frequently been forced to decline proffered charters because the vessel offered could not reach the wharves with safety; and that large vessels that might touch at Key West with freight or to fill bunkers avoid the port on account of the lack of adequate channel room. Recently the Mallory Steamship Line put a fine new steamer, the *Henry R. Mallory*, on the Texas run. This steamer is 439 feet long and draws 23 feet, and is the first of several new boats of about this size which are to be put in this service soon. On November 7, on her first voyage, touching at Key West, she grounded heavily on the shoal opposite the wharves, and in consequence of this mishap the owners have decided not to send her to that port again while present conditions continue.

14. Key West is an important port for deep-sea export and import. Located at the entrance to the Gulf of Mexico, this port is a natural port of call for vessels in the Gulf trade and occupies an exceptionally favorable location for a large bunker business in both coal and oil. Key West is the continental United States port nearest to Cuba, and with the completion of the Florida East Coast Railway to Key West and the establishment of a daily railway car-ferry service to Habana the tonnage and value of imports and exports through the port in the Cuban trade have greatly increased.

16. I therefore report that in my opinion the harbor of Key West is worthy of further improvement by the removal of a portion of the southern end of Frankford Bank with a view to widening the channel of the inner harbor opposite the wharves, and recommend that a survey of the locality and the preparation of a plan of improvement, with an estimate of cost, be authorized.

W. B. LADUE,

Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

I now desire to call your attention to the sixth and seventh indorsements, dated April 26 and 27, respectively, 1917, as follows. These may be found on pages 18 and 19:

8. In my opinion, the harbor of Key West is worthy of further improvement at this time to the extent of widening the channel through the inner harbor to 800 feet along the commercial water front, as shown by line D—E—C, the depth to be 26 feet at mean low water, at an estimated cost of \$232,700; the first appropriation to be \$150,000, with authority to enter into contract for the full amount of the estimate if reasonable and satisfactory bids are received, or to purchase, construct, or hire a suitable dredging plant and do the work therewith if it is found that an advantageous contract can not be made; the balance of the estimate to be appropriated in a single sum when needed.

W. B. LADUE,

Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

OFFICE DIVISION ENGINEER, SOUTHEAST DIVISION,
April 27, 1917.

To the CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY:

1. Forwarded.

2. I concur in the views and recommendations of the district engineer officer in paragraphs 6, 7, and 8.

JOHN MILLIS,

Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

Both of above were made after war was declared. All of the preceding indorsement may be found in the document first referred to.

This is taken from my statement before the committee and may be found on page 6 of same:

In that connection I will say the importance of Key West is a matter which the members of the committee and Members of Congress should now recognize, and we should make this appropriation to prepare for the future. We have been criticized because we did not do so in the past. I happened to find a report, dated March 24, 1913, Sixty-third Congress, second session, made by Capt. Hayden, of the United States Navy. On pages 10 and 11, paragraphs 6 and 20, you find as follows:

"6. The remarkable and unique location of Key West, its naval command of the Straits of Florida and the Yucatan Channel, and thus of the entire Gulf of Mexico, its commercial and trade importance as the nearest railway terminal to all of the West Indies and Central and South America, all combine to make its future importance such an absolute certainty that immediate action to build the proposed inclosed naval basin and breakwater would seem imperative.

"20. It is very likely that our next great naval battle will be fought in these waters about Key West, or between Key West and the Panama Canal. That battle is going to convert about half a billion dollars' worth of dreadnaughts into junk and make the loser sue for peace at any cost of treasure, territory, and prestige. The efficiency of this naval base at Key West may determine the result of that battle."

The above, perhaps, has nothing to do with river and harbor improvements. However, you are all familiar with the part Key West played in the Spanish-American War, and I am satisfied the memorandum made by Capt. Hayden in 1913 impresses you of the importance of Key West from a strategical standpoint.

Years ago only small ships plied into Key West. They did not encounter much difficulty and could properly take care of the commerce at said harbor. However, this commerce has grown to such an extent the small boats are no longer able to take care of it and it is not safe for the large vessels to touch at said port.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last year I read to the committee a letter from Secretary Daniels, calling to their attention and to the attention of my colleagues the importance of Key West, from a strategical standpoint, the same being, in part, as follows: "The Navy Department fully appreciates the importance of Key West as an offensive and defensive base, and all the department's plans include Key West." Let me say the Naval Board believes Key West may be to the United States what Heligoland is to Germany, if we will simply take advantage of same and make the necessary improvements. But ships are being taken away because of the lack of improvements. We have there a naval base, coast artillery, and wireless. There are several thousand young men in training there. There is also an aviation station located there. And yet when I try to get some one to say this is a war necessity, they do not seem to realize it. A few days ago I went down to see the Assistant Director General about the shortage of cars, the citizens of my district being unable to get cars. Last year, because of conditions of Key West Harbor and shortage of ships, there were hundreds of cars at Key West waiting to be unloaded. There are to-day, no doubt, many cars there waiting for ships; and yet you say that this appropriation is not necessary. I want to say to my colleagues that some day this country will wake up to the importance of Key West and give to that site the appropriations that I believe it is entitled to. [Applause.]

We have just passed an amendment to the bill, presented by the chairman of the committee, in which he says that the item, although it will take three years to complete, is a war measure. I say to you again, my colleagues, I believe if I had time to read these reports to you in full I would convince you of the importance of Key West, and if there is a war measure in the present bill, Key West should be included, and I make this statement in all sincerity. I have always voted for every proposition I believed was right, whether it affected my district or not, and all I ask at your hands is the same fair treatment. I have never asked my colleagues to vote otherwise. I simply say to you that I believe my amendment is a most meritorious one; that it is a war measure, if there is such a thing as a war measure, and therefore I trust that you will vote for it. [Applause.]

And I want to say further that I shall never crawl to some board, and this is without any spirit of criticism, not elected by anybody, to get the indorsement of a project, in order that I may include it in a bill. If the indorsements such as I have read to you, 10 in number, from the Secretary of the Navy and all these officers, except the first, Lieut. Col. Ladue, made after we went into the war, indorsing the proposition, telling you the necessity and urgency of it, are not sufficient to convince my colleagues, it would be useless for me to go to some board that had never been to Florida and try to convince them. Let me briefly divert just here to tell you that during the latter part of February of this year a Government collier went ashore at Key West, remained aground all night, and only floated by assistance of tugs. I apologize for taking up this much of your time. As I said before, if you believe it is a meritorious proposition, that the commerce should not be held back, and that the same recognition to Key West, at one end of this great country of ours, should be given as we gave to that great city of New York, at the other end, I believe you gentlemen in the spirit of fairness will grant this appropriation for which I ask. [Ap-

plause.] I have not referred to the many letters I have received and the valuable information contained in them because I have not the time. However, I want to again remind you of the letter from the Mallory Steamship Co., which I read to you last year. I trust you will look it up as I have not time to read it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the gentleman state how many steamship lines enter Key West?

Mr. SEARS. I did not. I forget the exact number, and can not tell without looking it up. I do not know as to lines, but for year 1916 there were about 5,000 American ships and 200 foreign. This includes arrivals and departures. There is quite a number. I believe, in going to Galveston and other Gulf ports, quite a large number of ships also pass, and most of those vessels could come in if this improvement was made. The principal commerce is from New York to Galveston, Cuba, and Central America.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are stops made at Gulf points and at Key West on the way around?

Mr. SEARS. They are, if they can stop.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know that commerce passing there is very large. I was wondering if the gentleman had any statistics on that point.

Mr. SEARS. It was \$37,051,539 and 1,028,374 tons in 1917.

A few moments ago I called your attention to the fact that the prophecy I made last year has come true. That was if relief was not granted the Mallory Line would be compelled to withdraw their large steamer, and this has been done. I also called your attention to the grounding of a Government collier.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there was another vessel in distress there a short time ago because of lack of water. What is the depth of the water?

Mr. SEARS. Nineteen feet for about 400 feet and about 26 feet for 300 feet, as I recall.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is contemplated by your amendment?

Mr. SEARS. This whole expenditure contemplates a width of 800 feet with a depth of 26 feet, and will not cost more than \$232,700, as I understand the report of engineers.

Again, let me say, if with car after car waiting to be unloaded and waiting for ships; with boats being forced not to come to the harbor on account of lack of proper and necessary improvement; with Government vessels going aground and running the risk of being ruined; with Key West recommended by naval experts as the place for a torpedo-boat destroyer and submarine base; with Key West designated a place for permanent seacoast defense; with all the Government war activities and holdings there; with her importance as a coaling and oil port; and with others not mentioned, does not constitute a war measure, then I would like to see one. I am satisfied my colleagues will support the amendment, because it is entitled to their support, and I hope and believe the able chairman of the committee will not oppose same.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made an interesting speech and a pleasant impression, and if that were controlling the committee might be inclined to vote for his amendment.

But, unfortunately, this is the condition affecting this amendment: This is a new project. In the formulation of the last river and harbor act, approved August 8, 1917, no new projects were included in the bill except such as were intimately associated with the prosecution of the war, and so recommended by the Secretary of War. The committee adopted that same policy in the formulation of this bill.

Now, gentlemen say that that is somewhat arbitrary. They say it is delegating an unusual discretion to an officer of the Government. But I think that if gentlemen were to consider very carefully they would decide that it was as fair and consistent a method as could be devised.

Now, let us see what would happen if the committee were to adopt this amendment, putting this new project into the bill, which does not come within the policy adopted by the committee in the formulation of the bill. Quite a number of new projects were insistently urged before the committee. I need mention only one. I see before me the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUFKIN], who came before us more than once with a delegation asking for the adoption of a new project for Beverly Harbor, Mass. We did not disparage the new project for Beverly; neither do we disparage the new project for Key West. In good time they will be adopted, and they will be constructed.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. We have been told that since 1913, since Key West has been able to get recognition from the River and Harbor Committee, of which the gentleman is chairman. I believe it will carry, but when can I assure them that it will be done?

Mr. SMALL. If the gentleman will tell me when this war will close I could more intelligently answer his question.

Now, as I was saying, we have in the consideration of this bill passed that part of the bill where it would be in order to offer an amendment adopting the new project for Beverly Harbor, Mass., and any Member could object to returning to the bill in order that an amendment might be offered to include it. Not only that, but there are others. In other words, if you depart from the policy of the committee, you open up a condition which may endanger the passage of any river and harbor bill at this session.

Now, here are the reasons for this policy: We are in a time of war. We are constantly told that we must not engage in any activities other than for the war, which require the employment of capital, the purchase of material, or the use of labor, and this policy was adopted. It is obviously fair, it was wise and just, and it has been applied without sectionalism, without any personal predilections, and without any partisanship to the entire country. The application of this policy affected Massachusetts and Florida and Louisiana and all other sections of the country, so that the gentleman who represents the Key West district in Florida is not alone in the position that he occupies in not having this new project adopted.

I hope the committee will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was this project approved by the engineers?

Mr. SMALL. Oh, yes. It has gone through all the processes, and has received the final approval of the Chief of Engineers, and has been sent to Congress by the Secretary of War in the regular way, just as the project for Beverly Harbor and others.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What stands against it from your committee viewpoint is that it has not been recommended as a war proposition?

Mr. SMALL. As a war measure.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman if the committee has considered the fact that several vessels have been in distress and, I believe, one wrecked, by reason of the fact that they did not have a sufficient depth of harbor at that place?

Mr. SMALL. I have no personal knowledge of that, but I will say this, that Key West has 30 feet in the main channel and 17 feet in the northwest channel. This is simply to widen the channel in front of the wharves.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SMALL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided, and there were—ayes 46, noes 23.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks for tellers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-six Members are present; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Dies	Garland	Ireland
Austin	Donovan	Garrett, Tenn.	James
Borland	Dooley	Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, S. Dak.
Brumbaugh	Doughton	Good	Johnson, Wash.
Byrnes, S. C.	Dowell	Goodall	Jones, Va.
Campbell, Pa.	Drukker	Gould	Jul
Carew	Dunn	Griffin	Kahn
Chandler, N. Y.	Edmonds	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kearns
Classon	Elliott	Harrison, Miss.	Kelley, Mich.
Cooper, Ohio	Estopinal	Hayes	Kelly, Pa.
Copley	Fairchild, B. L.	Heaton	Kettner
Costello	Fairchild, G. W.	Hefflin	Key, Ohio
Crago	Foss	Helms	Kiess, Pa.
Curry, Cal.	Flynn	Helvering	Knutson
Darrow	Fuller, Ill.	Hensley	Kreider
Davidson	Gallagher	Hicks	LaGuardia
Davis	Gallivan	Hollingsworth	Larsen
Decker	Gandy	Hood	Lobeck

McAndrews
McClintie
McCulloch
McLaughlin, Pa.
McLemore
Mann
Meeker
Mondell
Montague
Moon
Morin
Mudd
Neely
Norton
Parker, N. Y.

Polk
Porter
Pou
Powers
Rainey
Ramsey
Rankin
Reavis
Riordan
Roberts
Robinson
Rose
Rowland
Rucker
Sabath

Sanders, N. Y.
Saunders, Va.
Scott, Iowa
Scott, Pa.
Sherley
Shouse
Slayden
Smith, C. B.
Smith, T. F.
Snyder
Stedman
Stephens, Nebr.
Sterling, Pa.
Stevenson
Strong

Talbott
Taylor, Colo.
Templeton
Tinkham
Towner
Van Dyke
Vare
Voigt
Volstead
Walker
Webb
Woodyard

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the river and harbor appropriation bill, H. R. 10069, found itself without a quorum, whereupon he caused the roll to be called, when 302 Members, a quorum, answered to their names, and he reported the names of the absentees to be entered on the Journal and Record.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I think the demand for tellers is first in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from North Carolina demands tellers on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BOOHER and Mr. SEARS.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to have the amendment reported again. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendment of Mr. SEARS was again reported.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 99, noes 76.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mobile Harbor and Bar, and channel connecting Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound, Ala.: For maintenance, \$160,000; continuing improvement of Mobile Harbor and Bar, \$100,000; in all, \$260,000.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 10, strike out the numerals "\$100,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$200,000"; and in the same line strike out the numerals "\$260,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numerals "\$360,000."

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph provides for Mobile Harbor and Bar and the channel connecting Mobile Bay and Mississippi Sound. The bill as reported carries \$160,000 for maintenance and \$100,000 for further improvement of Mobile Harbor and Bar. These appropriations were based upon the recommendations in the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers.

On March 22 the Chief of Engineers sent a communication to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, making a recommendation to the effect that the appropriation for Mobile be increased \$100,000, so that the total appropriation, instead of \$260,000, will be \$360,000. I will send up a letter from the Chief of Engineers recommending this increased appropriation and will ask to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, March 22, 1913.

Hon. JOHN H. SMALL,
Chairman Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMALL: I. I am just in receipt of a report from the district engineer at Mobile, Ala., indicating that the amount carried in the pending river and harbor bill for that port should be increased, if practicable. The present amount, \$260,000, was based upon the estimates made by the district engineer last July to cover simply the operation of the Government dredging plant for the next fiscal year, it being considered impracticable either to build an additional dredge at this time on account of the state of the shipbuilding market, or to have work done by contract on account of the limitation imposed by law forbidding contracts at a cost in excess of 25 per cent over the cost of doing the work with Government plant.

2. The district engineer now reports that there has been a large increase within the last few months in the cost of operating the Government plant. The cost of fuel, for instance, has gone up about 100 per cent, and the cost of other supplies and of repairs and wages has also

increased to a marked extent. He, therefore, recommends that the estimate for Mobile Harbor be increased by \$100,000 in order to make adequate provision for the operation of the Government dredges and the prosecution of the improvement as rapidly as this plant will permit, until another appropriation can be made available by Congress at its next session.

3. In view of these circumstances, it is recommended that this item in the bill be amended so as to increase the amount of the appropriation from \$260,000 to \$360,000.

Very truly, yours,

FREDERIC V. ABBOT,
Brigadier General, Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, as stated, this amendment simply covers the increased estimate sent in by the Chief of Engineers, made necessary by reason of the conditions set forth in his letter. I ask for a vote.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRAY] offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. GRAY of Alabama: Strike out all on page 7, line 10, after the word "bar," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$700,000; in all, \$860,000."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, this is simply a question of how much shall be appropriated for the maintenance and further improvement of Mobile Harbor and Bar. The amount carried in the bill plus the amendment which I added for \$100,000 additional, based upon a later estimate, is all that the engineers say they can profitably and wisely expend until June 30, 1919, and any sum more than that is unnecessary and has no recommendation and will not be expended. No one disputes the importance of Mobile—

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. How does the gentleman know they can not expend it; just a mere opinion of the engineers?

Mr. SMALL. I know it because the Chief of Engineers, after a careful investigation, reports that it is all he can possibly expend, and as the money has to be expended under his supervision he is best qualified to express an opinion.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield further right there?

Mr. FREAR. Was not that statement also made by Col. Newcomer before our committee?

Mr. SMALL. Yes; and repeated by the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama. I wanted to ask the gentleman: Suppose that the Government could get two other dredges at some point on the Gulf and put there at Mobile. Does the gentleman presume that it could not be wisely spent if they could get the dredges from some other place?

Mr. SMALL. Why, in answer to that, if we are going to make appropriations based on suppositions on the hiring of dredges or getting them from some other sources, or if we are going to speculate as to what might be spent, we would have no stable basis upon which to predicate the appropriation. This estimate was made in the same manner as all other estimates for improvements throughout the country.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I will.

Mr. BURNETT. When was the \$260,000 estimate made?

Mr. SMALL. That was submitted in the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. BURNETT. Made when?

Mr. SMALL. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. It was printed and submitted to Congress at the convening of this session in December last. The estimate will be found in the first volume of the Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. BURNETT. As a matter of fact, they have moved up the estimates \$100,000 in a few months?

Mr. SMALL. Based entirely, if the gentleman heard the letter from the Chief of Engineers, on the condition stated there.

Mr. BURNETT. Did not the same condition in the December—

Mr. SMALL. That is based entirely on the increased cost of labor and material.

Mr. BURNETT. What does the district engineer recommend?

Mr. SMALL. He recommended a larger sum.

Mr. BURNETT. How much?

Mr. SMALL. His recommendation was over \$700,000. However, I am coming to that. It was originally contemplated when this new project for Mobile Harbor was adopted that the Government would construct a new dredge, but since our entrance into this war it has been deemed a wise policy by this committee that we should not construct any new dredges.

At a time when the United States Shipping Board was straining every nerve in the securing of labor and material for the

construction of merchant ships for our use during the period of the war, it was deemed unwise and unpatriotic to embark the War Department in the construction of new dredges. And a good part of that appropriation—and I will not attempt to go into details—is for the construction of a new dredge, and I might say that a dredge now costs about twice as much as it did in 1914. Now, coming to this appropriation that is recommended, it is based upon what can be expended during the next fiscal year by the use of the Government plant at Mobile. This is all they can spend, based upon the best estimate of the cost of labor and material for the operation of the Government plant. And we ought not to appropriate any more than can be spent. Some gentleman has said, "Could not we hire dredges from some other station on the Gulf?" No. We examined the Chief of Engineers, or his representative, upon that point, and he reported there was no dredge which could be secured.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMALL. So, Mr. Chairman, expressed in a nutshell, this amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRAY] seeks an appropriation for a larger sum than is estimated, and there is no appropriation in this bill, either for maintenance or further improvement, in excess of the amount estimated by the Chief of Engineers for each improvement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude with this comment: The River and Harbor Committee formulated this bill along lines which they believed represented the best sentiment of the House and of the country. It has been formulated further along lines which had the approval of the Secretary of War and of the President. The President in several conferences which I and other members of the committee had with him, after mature reflection advised as strongly as he could the construction of this bill along the lines which were followed by the committee. The Committee of the Whole has just adopted a new project for Key West, contrary to the policy of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; that is to say, it had not been recommended as a war necessity. We are going to ask at the end of this bill that a separate vote be had in order that the House may determine what its policy shall be. If the House wishes a large bill, then let it vote for a motion to recommit this bill to the committee, and we will with pleasure construct a bill adopting a number of new projects, if you think it will meet with the Executive approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMALL. We, as members of the committee, have not formulated this bill without a struggle. If I might make a personal reference, I will say that there is no Member of this House who has been more besieged by his own constituents for new projects than the chairman of this committee has been. But believing that this policy was wise, that it reflected the sentiment of the House, I resolved that I would be a good soldier, and I told my constituents the policy which we had adopted, and that they must abide by it.

But if this policy does not meet with the approval of the House, if you wish us to formulate a bill relieved of these limitations, it is only for the House to say so. Then if we come to a ye-and-nay vote on a separate proposition, and you want to go outside the policy and adopt the project for Key West and other amendments to this bill, you can say so, and then refer the bill to the committee, and we will follow the final judgment of the House in the formulation of this bill.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Has not the gentleman stated in the committee that any such bill would not meet the approval of the Executive, and have not letters been received from the Secretary of War opposing such amendments?

Mr. SMALL. I doubt the propriety of quoting the President. He never told me that he would not approve the bill, and if he had told me I doubt the propriety of quoting him.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. I yield to the gentleman. The other gentleman began speaking before I had yielded to him.

Mr. DUPRÉ. That was characteristic of the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMALL. I did not intend that the House should draw that inference.

Mr. FREAR. I understood that the gentleman had yielded to me, or I would not have addressed him.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman from Wisconsin always obeys these amenities. I was about to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question, since certain things are being stated about what happened in the committee, whether he would be permitted to say how unanimous and enthusiastic the vote was not to include any new projects in the bill?

Mr. SMALL. I do not think it would be within the rules to discuss what occurred in the committee or how the members of the committee voted. The committee voted to report this bill by a large majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SMALL. Does the gentleman desire me to get further time or will he get it in his own right?

Mr. DUPRÉ. I trust that the gentleman from Tennessee, in the chair, will give me some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I trust that I violate none of the proprieties, so carefully observed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], when I say that upon the roll call on the final report of this bill I was the only member of the committee who voted against a favorable report thereon. When I found that my colleague from Wisconsin had not even registered his vote against it I felt quite sure that I was right in voting against a favorable report. [Laughter.] I did not vote against a favorable report on the bill because there was any item in it to which I objected. I voted against it because I objected primarily to the manner in which the bill had been constructed.

There have been denunciations in the past, in which, I think, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] possibly has indulged, and certainly in which I have engaged, against lump-sum appropriations. Well, I can not see the difference, and I do not care to look into differences that do not make a difference, that have not substance, between a lump-sum appropriation put over at the point of capitulation in the Senate to the garrulity of those old gentlemen who occupy these high places and this bill that has been reported from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which I happen to have the honor to be a member. [Laughter.] I do not see any difference between a lump-sum appropriation bill written in the law and one that is practically and truly written in the law when we have a representative of the Chief of Engineers coming to our committee and saying, "Well, I approve of this; I approve of that." And I use the personal pronoun probably erroneously, and certainly not offensively, because certainly the gentleman who represented the Chief of Engineers, and through him the Secretary of War, was as fine a type of the Corps of Engineers as I know. But what I resent—and that is the primary basis of my objection to this bill—is that the representative of the Chief of Engineers should come to the committee and say, as he did:

My corps is under pledge to the Secretary of War not to put into this bill anything that we do not think is necessary to the prosecution of the war and its early and successful prosecution to a finish.

Apparently the House has been disagreeing with this gentleman, disagreeing with the chairman of my committee, disagreeing with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], disagreeing with the conclusions of the committee, for it has decided that the amendment that was not proposed in the committee by the gentleman from New York, my friend DEMPSEY, should prevail. They have decided that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] should also prevail, and of course I have heard of the combination of North and South before. I am not talking about any other combinations. It looks to me as if, considering the Mobile item here—and I can not forecast what will be its result—possibly the suggestion of the chairman, that this bill be recommitted, might not be altogether indefensible. [Laughter.]

I voted against the bill in committee, and I think if I had something to say and I could get some of my colleagues to agree with me on the committee, I might report a bill here that my friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] might approve. [Laughter.] It has been truly appealing to me to see him taking up the cudgels for river and harbor improvements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I hope my friend from Illinois will secure me a few minutes more.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may have five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman from Illinois responded to my suggestion as handsomely as I thought he would. He has been the friend of river and harbor legislation—God save us from our friends—in the past. [Laughter.] And now he is the champion of improving this bill.

He certainly was the Deus machina yesterday that brought the Dempsey amendment to favorable consideration. I hope that the people of Illinois will recognize his merit in future senatorial aspirations. [Applause.] The Constitution limits the people of a State in voting for Senators, and it also limits the people of a State in voting for Congressmen beyond the borders of the State; but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is at large, and I hope that the people of New York will remember his glad services in the development of that harbor. [Laughter.] For my part I will say that I bore the adoption of that amendment with considerable Christian fortitude. [Laughter.] And I did not mind when Key West was recognized this afternoon, though I felt constrained, under the ethics of the situation, to vote against both of those propositions. But I would suggest hereafter when we have a rivers and harbors bill to frame—and possibly we may have to reframe it now—that we have a composition in bankruptcy among the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] in getting the bill put before the House. You never can tell how the House feels about a bill. Sometimes it thinks a bill is too large, and certainly in the last day or two it has shown that it thinks this one is niggardly, inadequate, and unworthy, and that is the reason why I voted against the measure. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, I know the House has been delighted with the statement made by my friend from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ], who is a very genial member of the committee and of the House. To my mind, though, the Members of this House have more to think of than the few quips and turns which he gave in this discussion.

The Army engineers have made an effort to hold this bill within limits. I wanted to express my approval of it. There are things in the bill that I do not like. I can not believe they are justified, even from the ordinary understanding; but the efforts of the Army engineers to hold this bill within limitations ought to be supported by this House. I watched as Members went between the tellers, and nearly every man who has supported "pork" propositions in the past went through here laughing and chuckling because the committee bill was being broken down. I do not say all did, because there are some men who are undoubtedly just as honest in purpose as I am. [Laughter and cries of "Oh, no!"] Well, many of you, I want to tell you, can not defend your records; I care not what you say.

Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas. Not against your criticism, in your judgment.

Mr. FREAR. That is all right. I will not question the honesty of anyone; but let me say this: I do not care what your action may be; only one man on that side of the House has risen in an effort to prevent the passage of these amendments. Break down this bill if you choose, get the "pork" into it if you choose.

If you feel that you are engaging in any service for the benefit of this Government at a time when we are sending men all over this country trying to raise money to finance the war, when you support projects like one and the other that are being urged here against the report of the Army engineers, you have a right to so vote, but I can not understand how you do it. I have no more interest in this than has the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ]. I can not express here what occurred in the committee as to the understanding of the probabilities of this bill being enacted into law. I hope that it will be; that is, if it is gotten through in a fair way. I would that we could get the bill through in some fair form. But let me say to you, gentlemen—

Mr. DUPRÉ. I think the gentleman is justified in saying that. I say that in all kindness.

Mr. FREAR. I just want to say this, in conclusion, that I have tried to defeat these bills in the past and I have succeeded once or twice in exposing some of the scandalous conditions in them. I have been opposed very frankly and very bitterly at times on this floor. In fact, a few moments ago a gentleman expressed himself very intensely because he was not getting enough in his case for his State. But it makes no difference. I feel that I am doing what is right, and that must be the guide

for every man. Gentlemen on the Democratic side, I want to say to you that you and your party have got to go before the country soon. Let it be understood that only one man rose on the Democratic side to oppose these amendments. We are trying the best we can to keep this bill within reasonable confines. You can sweep us off our feet. You can bring in your amendments here unquestionably, but it is a dangerous thing to do, to vote against the report of the Army engineers, who have sought to provide a bill here in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of War and that it be kept within war limits.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Have not the gentleman's friends on his side been largely responsible for such amendments to this bill as have prevailed?

Mr. FREAR. Not only that, but I will say that I am not the guider of the consciences of the gentlemen on this or the other side, many of whom have voted for some of these amendments.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How about being the guardian of the consciences on the gentleman's own side?

Mr. FREAR. Of course, no party lines ought to be drawn. Let me say this, that when the chairman of the committee is the only gentleman on that side rising to oppose this \$500,000 increase in appropriation, and these amendments are going through, one after another, you of the dominant party must accept the full responsibility. You did not give anything extra for New York—that was a question of phraseology, voting for it to be put through at this time—but you are here putting in new and unjustified appropriations, adding to the bill until it is likely to fall from the increased weight.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Not now. You can break down the bill, possibly, as the chairman of the committee says; you can send it back, but I warn you that you will not want to go before the country on such a proposition.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRAY] simply provides a larger appropriation for a project that now has the unqualified approval of the Board of Engineers as well as the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The present bill carries an appropriation for this work, and the sum called for in the amendment is well within the estimated ultimate cost of this approved and adopted project. The very fact that the present bill carries an appropriation for this work is conclusive evidence of its importance and that it is regarded as a war necessity.

The only reason assigned by the engineers for not recommending a larger appropriation at this time is apprehension on their part that a sufficient number of dredges may not be secured to complete the work during the next fiscal year. If the necessary dredges can not be had, then the appropriation will not be used. In view of the importance of the work, sufficient funds should be provided for the vigorous prosecution of the same if dredges can be secured for this purpose.

The same condition obtains here that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] points out obtained at New York, and which caused the House on yesterday to vote an increased sum over that recommended by the Board of Engineers. It is a matter of great importance that the 30-foot channel at the port of Mobile be deepened at the earliest possible time. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRAY] has called attention to the large shipbuilding operations now being carried on at Mobile, and to the further fact that a new company is now preparing to expend from twelve to fourteen million dollars for an additional large shipyard there. The letter from the Shipping Board read by the gentleman from Alabama clearly shows the interest that the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation feel in the deepening of the channel at this port.

The Shipping Board has already let a number of large contracts for the building of ships at Mobile, and additional contracts will be let. An unlimited amount of fine shipbuilding timber is available to the yards at this port, within a distance of 240 miles, with all-year river and rail connection therefrom. Two large lumber mills in my district, about 200 miles by river from Mobile, are now supplying large quantities of timber for ships being built at Mobile, and some of this timber is being carried on barges down the Warrior River.

I desire to call attention to the further fact that an inextinguishable amount of bunker steam coal in quality equal to that supplied to vessels at Norfolk and Philadelphia is in close proximity to Mobile and can be transported there by both rail and water. Labor conditions are excellent, and this fact, coupled with the ready availability of coal and timber, empha-

size the supreme importance of deepening and widening this channel at once.

The district engineer is not in accord with the Board of Engineers as to the amount of money that can be wisely expended during the next fiscal year, and his report indicates that the amount asked for in the amendment now under consideration can be wisely expended. In view then of the excellent shipbuilding facilities at Mobile, its nearness to timber and coal, I feel confident, if the required appropriation is now made to complete the channel, that sufficient dredges will be forthcoming to do the work. Dredges from other places, not so well provided with labor and facilities for building ships as Mobile, can and will be diverted.

Vessels with a draft of 30 feet are now under construction at this port, which fact strongly argues the importance of pushing to early completion the work of deepening and widening the channel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, can we not have an understanding as to when we shall have a vote on this paragraph and all amendments thereto? I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Will not the gentleman allow me five minutes?

Mr. SMALL. Then make it seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in seven minutes.

Mr. SMALL. Two minutes to be used by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and five minutes by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If they are building ships with 30 feet draft at Mobile and you have only a 26-foot channel, how are they going to get them out of there? And, also, I would ask if there is any wisdom in the determination of the Shipping Board to build ships of such a draft at such a place?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The 30-foot draft applies to the loaded vessel; unloaded there will be no trouble in getting out through the 26-foot channel.

It is of the greatest importance, however, that ships should be loaded at a great supply port like Mobile, and not be required after completion to leave empty.

This bill commits Congress to a 30-foot channel at Mobile, and if you will now supply the necessary funds for this work the dredges, in my judgment, will be forthcoming to complete it at the earliest possible time.

I invite the attention of the Members to the following data in reference to Mobile, which I incorporated some time since in the hearings before the Naval Committee:

Mobile's claims for consideration as a site for large shipbuilding yards are based upon the fact that she possesses in preeminent degree all the qualifications necessary, viz, strategic location, defensive works, abundance of skilled and unskilled labor, and near vicinity to raw materials used in construction, as well as being favored with a mild climate, which permits of outside work all the year round.

Mobile not only enjoys water transportation from the coal and iron districts of Alabama, but is the nearest Gulf port to all the great manufactured iron and steel centers of the country.

The surrounding country is not subject to inundation, and traffic is not disturbed by weather conditions at any period of the year.

Mobile possesses the following advantages:

Located 30 miles from Gulf; safe from sea attack; entrance to Mobile Bay protected by two forts.

Mild climate, permitting outside construction the year round.

Surrounding country not subject to inundation.

Undisturbed by rise and fall of tide (1.4 feet average tide).

Two sources of transportation, viz, rail and water.

Five railroads operating from coal and iron districts to Mobile, also reaching directly and indirectly the greatest manufacturing cities of the United States.

All-year navigation on rivers, guaranteeing iron, coal, and timber supply to Mobile should railroads fail in crisis.

More skilled machinist labor than any Gulf port.

More ship carpenters, calkers, etc., than rest Gulf ports combined.

More foundries and boiler works than any other Gulf port.

More iron, coal, and timber located upon Alabama's inland waterways, reaching Mobile, than is available to any other Gulf port.

Cheapest inland water transportation of any Gulf port.

Lowest basis of rail rates enjoyed by any Gulf port, and lower rates from iron and coal districts of Alabama than other Gulf ports west of Mobile enjoy, guaranteeing cheapest raw materials.

Over 27 feet of water at mean low tide from Gulf to Mobile, and with very little work, estimated at not exceeding 50 days of dredging, the entire channel can be made available for vessels with a draft of 30 feet.

Fresh water.

Summed up. Mobile has the best location on the Gulf; has advanced over all other Gulf ports in quantity and quality of its skilled labor (machinist and shipbuilding), and is nearest port by rail and water to great iron, coal, and timber supply of Alabama.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the proposition involved in this amendment is, if this \$850,000 is authorized and is not used it remains in the Treasury. If, on the other hand, dredges can be obtained and the money is not authorized, then the work has to stop. The Government takes no chances, loses no money, and yet the work itself takes a very serious chance if the authorization is not given. In addition to what my friend from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] has said, I want to emphasize this fact. There are plants for the construction of ships at Mobile, some of which ships will be of 30 feet draft, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks how they will get them out. They can get them out empty, but the Government does not want them sent out empty, and that is one reason for deepening this channel. At that great port there are millions of tons of coal, millions of feet of lumber, and other things that can be shipped every year, and these ships that are now being built there ought not to be forced to go away from the great coal-producing section of the south and of the country to other ports to be loaded. That is the common sense proposition involved here. The Government takes no chances on the expenditure of the money, but the Government does take a chance, it seems to me, if the authorization is not made, because, if the dredges can be obtained, then they will soon run up against the proposition that they have no money to continue the work on the channel.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. For a question.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Is not the gentleman's argument equally applicable to the development of the Charleston Channel?

Mr. BURNETT. I do not know. I did not hear the discussion on that item.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman was not concerned about that.

Mr. BURNETT. I am concerned about everything that is in the interest of winning this war and getting the ships and getting them loaded and getting them out to help win it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In Alabama?

Mr. BURNETT. Anywhere; it does not make any difference where. I have not a cent in this bill. The great river that I live on is an inland river, with obstructions in the center and no navigation to Mobile Bay. I have no pork in the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FEAR] can not shake his gory locks at me and yell about pork, because there is not a dollar of pork in it for me; but I am arguing for a just cause in the interest of getting ships built quickly, ships gotten out quickly from the place where they are to be made and put into use and laden with coal when we carry them out. Mr. McAdoo recognizes the congested conditions in all the north Atlantic ports, and he himself has said that there should be a considerable shifting to the ports of the South in order to relieve the congestion in the north Atlantic.

Now, gentlemen, how can you shift that condition, how can you remove that congestion, unless you afford ample port facilities through which our exports may be made from our section of the country as well as every other section of the country? Recommendation has been made, as I understand, to divert a large amount of foodstuffs that are being produced in the Middle West to the ports of the South in order to relieve congested conditions elsewhere. We remember the congestion in the transportation of coal last winter. We recollect how the cry went up all over the country that there was not sufficient means of transportation to carry coal to keep the women and children of this country from freezing; and yet here is a proposition right at the foot of the great coal-producing section of the country, and you propose to tie it up and hem up a port there, so that it will not be able to allow the ships to go out or in laden with products for which all of this country is crying. Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be peculiarly a question of war emergency. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] holds as a sword of Damocles over us the threat that if we are going to put amendments on this bill it will be recommitted to the committee. Well, those kind of threats never have scared me. If this House believes that there has been a mistake made by the committee, or even by as high officials as the Board of Engineers back of it, it ought without hesitation to correct that mistake. Is there not a report of the district engineer, the man on the ground, the man who knows more about it, probably, than the Board of Engineers who are sitting here in their chairs in Washington? I hope the recommendation of that engineer will prevail in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And all other cases, because I have read some the gentleman would not like.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRAY].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GRAY of Alabama) there were—yeas 17, yeas 49.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken, and the amendment was adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if it is not about time for us to rise.

Mr. SMALL. I think so.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am very glad to see the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Illinois are in accord.

Mr. SMALL. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the requests of the gentlemen? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMALL. I want to say for the information of the committee that as I understand it this bill will not be taken up to-morrow, but on Friday.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10069, the rivers and harbors appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal on to-morrow that Senate joint resolution 123, known as the quota or amendment to the draft law, be considered in order until disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] asks unanimous consent that what is called the quota bill, Senate joint resolution 123, be taken up to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, and shall be the continuing order until it is completed. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman how much general debate he proposes?

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Committee on Military Affairs asked for five hours' general debate, and the Committee on Rules have tentatively agreed to a rule on this proposition with three hours' of general debate. On account of the number of gentlemen who wanted to speak on it I am going to ask that a compromise be made of four hours' general debate.

Mr. GILLET. I think that will be satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask that now?

Mr. DENT. I will ask that now.

Mr. SMALL. Reserving the right to object, just a moment, we expect to go on with the river and harbor bill on Friday morning. Suppose this draft bill is not completed to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. If this request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] is agreed to, they will go on with the quota bill if it extends beyond to-morrow.

Mr. DENT. We certainly ought to finish the bill in six hours, because it will not take long, I will state to the gentleman from North Carolina, to read the bill. It is not very long.

Mr. SMALL. Could not the gentleman couple with his request for unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

Mr. DENT. I would not like to do that in view of the fact that the members of the Military Committee who are not here have not been consulted on this proposition, and they expect to be here at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, that Senate resolution No. 123 shall be taken up for consideration, with four hours for general debate, and that the resolution shall be the continuing order until disposed of. Is there objection?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to object to this bill which the chairman says is important, but at the same time I

think the river and harbor bill has some rights in the House. We would like to take it up on Friday.

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman that in my own judgment this bill will be disposed of in one day. But the gentleman knows that no Member of the House can predict what is going to happen.

Mr. SMALL. Will the gentleman amend his unanimous consent so as not to continue longer than 2 o'clock on Friday?

Mr. MADDEN. You can not do that.

Mr. DENT. I would not like to do that. I am sure the bill ought to be disposed of long before that.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman makes the request I will have to object, because I think the most important thing before the country is the bill the gentleman is asking to take up for consideration, and it ought to be disposed of without anything else intervening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of what I consider to be the importance of this bill in connection with the war, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MILLER of Washington, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for April 11, 12, 13, and 14, 1918, on account of taking part in the liberty-loan campaign.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by incorporating the program adopted by the interallied Socialists at the conference held in London last February.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by incorporating the platform agreed to by the interallied Socialists in London last February. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, how long is this?

Mr. LONDON. It is from 4 to 6 pages. I think it will make about 2 pages of the Record. It is a very important document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, who stated that this is a very important document, what particular bearing or importance it has in the present emergency in which this country finds itself now?

Mr. LONDON. It has the greatest bearing, because it is a statement by the Socialists of France, England, and Italy on the objects and aims of the war, showing their support of the war and indorsing the main principles of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, April 11, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a proposed clause of legislation reappropriating for the fiscal year 1919 the balance of the appropriation for Mount Rainier National Park for 1918 which may remain unexpended at the close of the year (H. Doc. No. 1033), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BURNETT, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 204) to provide for the fitting up of quarters in the post-office building at the city of Sacramento, Cal., for the accommodation of the District Court of the Northern District of California and its officers, and making an appropriation therefor, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 482), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10600) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to exchange the present Federal building site at Eatonton, Ga., for another site on the public square in said city, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 483), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. POLK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11364) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 481), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 11361) to confer on the President power to prescribe charter rates and freight rates and to requisition vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11362) to amend the shipping act approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a United States Shipping Board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions, and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 11363) to amend paragraph 2 of section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 11365) to make The Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 11366) authorizing the Secretary of War to provide for medical treatment and hospital care of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees in the Military Establishment while on furlough, necessitated by disability originating in the line of duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 11367) to provide for vocational rehabilitation and return to civil employment of disabled persons discharged from the military or naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 11368) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent in fee simple to the National Lincoln-Douglass Sanatorium and Consumptive Hospital Association (a corporation), of Denver, Colo., for a certain-described tract of land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BAER: A bill (H. R. 11369) to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food by authorizing the Department of Agriculture to aid in the control of flood waters of the Red River Valley of the North in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, thereby increasing the areas of land suitable for the production of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBBINS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 278) proposing the removal of certain Government departments from the city of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Resolution (H. Res. 306) for the consideration of S. 3388; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, requesting Congress to provide for public ownership and operation of coal mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring free transportation for all soldiers and sailors in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of the State of Massachusetts, requesting the Congress to provide for public ownership and operation of coal mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 11364) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; committed to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 11370) granting a pension to Christie Jones and Goldfish Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 11371) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Emory; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11372) granting a pension to Thomas Epert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11373) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 11374) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 11375) for the relief of Hassie Cantrell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 11376) granting a pension to Charles W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 11377) for the relief of Laurence L. Faure; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11378) granting a pension to Charles H. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11379) granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Waugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11380) granting a pension to Charles Francis Gilroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 11381) granting an increase of pension to J. M. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 11382) granting an increase of pension to Absalom A. Lusk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 11383) granting a pension to Mary R. Mellinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 11384) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11385) for the relief of Albert Hamilton; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 11386) granting an increase of pension to Addie Burns; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11387) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11388) granting a pension to Hannah E. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 11389) granting a pension to John L. C. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11390) granting a pension to John S. Salisbury; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11391) granting an increase of pension to William Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Committee of Six of New York City, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2917, for increasing the number of chaplains in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the mass meeting of the loyal citizens of Chicago, commending President Wilson for placing the American troops under Commander Gen. Foch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the district conference, International Association of Rotary Clubs, Hutchinson, Kans., favoring the construction of swimming pools at various Army training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of E. C. Johnson and 18 other citizens of Union, Mo., protesting against the lowering of the price of corn by the United States Food Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of St. Johns Valley Farm Club, protesting against the lowering of the price of corn by the influence of the

United States Food Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Macedonia (Mo.) Farm Club and J. H. Guese and six other citizens of New Haven, Mo., protesting against the lowering of the price of corn by the United States Food Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, opposing legislation looking to the reemployment of convict labor in the manufacture, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition in opposition to the zone system as applied to second-class mail matter passed by the executive committee of the Authors' League of America (Inc.); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of American Peat Society of New York, relative to the development of the natural resources of nitrogen; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petitions of the junior class, Seneca (Wis.) High School, and River City Lodge, No. 108, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Portsmouth, Ohio, protesting against zone system of postal rates on periodicals and newspapers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, opposing the Tavenner bill, H. R. 8665; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mendota Woman's Club, of Mendota, Ill., protesting against zone system and demanding its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, favoring continued use of the pneumatic-tube mail-distributing service in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Western Springs Woman's Club, Western Springs, Ill., protesting against zone system and demanding its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition in opposition to the zone system as applied to second-class mail matter passed by the executive committee of the Authors' League of America (Inc.); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Berkeley Center (Cal.) Civic League, urging confiscation of all food products held by the brewers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Elizabeth H. Waugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of King County Pomona Grange, No. 13, State of Washington, petitioning for price to be fixed on all commodities produced by labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of E. E. Hopkins Camp, No. 18, United Spanish War Veterans, South Bend, Wash., favoring the bill to pension widows and children of officers and enlisted men of the Spanish-American War, Philippine insurrection, and Chinese rebellion; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolutions of Pawtucket (R. I.) Typographical Union, No. 212, urging passage of Sherwood old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of the district conference, International Association of Rotary Clubs, Hutchinson, Kans., March 8, 1918, favoring the training of National Army men in swimming; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition adopted by the International Order of Good Templars, favoring total prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Women's Missionary Society of the Good Hope United Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the enactment of a law prohibiting the liquor traffic for the duration of the war and the period of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Letters from Sherwood & Sherwood, James Graham Manufacturing Co., W. W. Montague & Co., Heyman-Wellman Co., and H. S. Crocker Co., all of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Senate bill 3692, regarding the manner of payment of income and war excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, letters from River City Lodge, No. 8, of Portsmouth, Ohio; Mrs. Harry A. Davis, of Fig Tree, Cal.; the La Pine Commercial Club, of La Pine, Oreg.; and the Pennsylvania College for Women, of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, letter from the Western Springs Woman's Club, of Western Springs, Ill., protesting against zone system and demanding its repeal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.